

# MODERN. LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

C. S. SINGLETON

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

KEMP MALONE

DON CAMERON ALLEN

---

VOLUME LXIII

1948

---

BALTIMORE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

1948

# TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME LXIII

	PAGE
Menner, R. J., Anglian and Saxon Elements in Wulfstan's Vocabulary	1
Deierkauf-Holsboer, S. W., La Vie théâtrale à Paris de 1612 à 1614 .	10
Giovannini, G., Keats' Elysium of Poets . . . . .	19
Buhler, C. F., New Manuscripts of <i>The Dicts and Sayings of the Philosophers</i> . . . . .	26
Cooley, F. D., Two Notes on the Chess Terms in <i>The Book of the Duchess</i> . . . . .	30
Bronson, B. H., Daisies Pied and Icicles . . . . .	35
Johnson, Stanley, Sir Henry Goodere and Donne's Letters . . . .	38
McCue, George S., Sam. Johnson's Word-Hoard . . . . .	43
Hamilton, Horace E., A Note on James Thomson's Sources . . .	46
Feinstein, G. W., Twain as Forerunner of Tooth-and-Claw Criticism	49
Austin, H. D., Uguiccone on the Name of Y . . . . .	50
Cassidy, F. G., The Merit of Malkyn . . . . .	52
Kreuzer, J. R., A Note on Chaucer's <i>Tale of Melibee</i> . . . . .	53
Pratt, R. A., Two Chaucer Allusions. 1819 and 1899 . . . . .	55
Kirby, Thomas A., "The Triple Tun" Again . . . . .	56
Dunlap, A. R., A Pilgrimage to the Holy Land . . . . .	57
Spitzer, Leo, <i>Basket</i> . . . . .	58
Chapman, C. O., Ticius to Tuskan, <i>G&amp;K</i> , Line 11 . . . . .	59
Starr, H. W., <i>Beowulf</i> in the Eighteenth Century . . . . .	60
Taylor, Archer, An Ordnance-Map of Feminine Charms. . . . .	61
Deutsch, O. E., Poetry Preserved in Music. Bibliographical Notes on Smollett and Oswald, Handel and Haydn . . . . .	73
Huntley, F. L., On the Persons in Dryden's <i>Essay of Dramatic Poetry</i>	88
Nordmeyer, George, The Judge in the <i>Meyer Helmbrecht</i> . . . . .	95
Stephens, J. C., Jr., The Verge of the Court and Arrest for Debt in Fielding's <i>Amelia</i> . . . . .	104
McKillop, A. D., A Letter from Samuel Richardson to Alexis Claude Clairaut . . . . .	109
Waldhorn, Arthur, Charles Churchill and 'Statira' . . . . .	114
Splitter, H. W., Note on a "Beowulf" Passage . . . . .	118
Smith, Roland M., On the Dating of the <i>Cath Maige Rátha</i> . . . .	122
Magoun, F. P., Jr, OE <i>ealle þrage</i> . . . . .	127
Sturtevant, A. M., The Derivations of Old Norse <i>Holkeir</i> and <i>Folkveir</i> , Poetic Designations for <i>horse</i> . . . . .	128
Thorpe, James., A Note on Coleridge's "Gutch Commonplace Book,"	130
Marsh, Philip, Hawthorne and Griswold.. . . .	132
McKeithan, D. M., A Letter from Mark Twain to Francis Henry Skrine in London.. . . .	134



	PAGE
Draper, J. W., Thomas J. Wise and the Wrenn <i>Catalogue</i> . . .	135
Comment by Miss Fannie Ratchford . . .	138
Judson, A. C., Mother Hubbard's Ape . . .	145
Manning, C. A., The <i>Two Brothers</i> of Lermontov and Pechorin . . .	149
Williamson, Edward, Tasso's Annotations to Trissino's Poetics . . .	153
Williamson, Edward, An Unpublished Tasso Sonnet . . .	158
Storer, M. E., French Women Members of the Ricovrati of Padua . . .	161
Morrisette, B. A., Richard Aldington's Proposed "Source" for <i>La Princesse de Clèves</i> . . .	164
Oake, R. B., <i>De l'Esprit des Loix</i> , Books XXVI-XXXI . . .	167
Evans, D. O., The Hegelian Idea in <i>Hernani</i> . . .	171
Niess, R. J., Julian Benda and Hugues Rebell . . .	174
Liesay, J. L., The "D. T." Poems in Overbury's <i>A Wife</i> . . .	177
Gilbert, A. H., The Embleme for December in the <i>Shepherd's Calendar</i> . . .	181
Combs, H. C., Habington's <i>Castara</i> and the Date of His Marriage . . .	182
Allen, D. C., Cowley's Pindar . . .	184
Duffy, Charles, W. E. Leonard's Annotations in a Copy of <i>Poems 1916-1917</i> . . .	185
Schoeck, R. J., T. S. Eliot, Mary Queen of Scots, and Guillaume de Machaut . . .	187
Kane, R. J., A. E. Housman and the New Prefect of the Ambrosian . . .	189
Gilbert, A. H., Ovid's Mulberry in Milton's <i>Pro Se Defensio</i> . . .	190
McKeithan, D. M., More about Mark Twain's War with English Critics of America . . .	221
Nearing, Homer, Jr., Julius Caesar and the Tower of London . . .	228
Maxwell, Baldwin, "Twenty Good-Nights"— <i>The Knight of the Burning Pestle</i> and Middleton's <i>Family of Love</i> . . .	233
Reese, Gertrude, Robert Browning and <i>A Blot in the 'Scutcheon</i> . . .	237
Spitzer, Leo, Anc. Fr. <i>cha[te]le[s]</i> , <i>cheles</i> , <i>cheles</i> , <i>qu[est]eles</i> 's'il vous plaît . . .	240
Nozick, Martin, A Source of Don Ramón de la Cruz . . .	244
Smiley, J. R., Grimm's Alleged Authorship of Certain Articles on the Theater in Paris . . .	248
Sledd, James, The English Verses in the Huloet-Higgins <i>Dictionnaire</i> of 1572 . . .	251
Condee, R. W., Lodge and a Lucan Passage from <i>Mirandula</i> . . .	254
Le Comte, E. S., "Thieves of the Day's Beauty" . . .	256
Bond, W. H., Sidney and Cupid's Dart . . .	258
Dunlap, Rhodes, The Date of Donne's "The Annunciation and Passion" . . .	258
Denny, Margaret, The Literary Hero in a Sentimental Age: an Unlisted Reference to Milton . . .	259
Allen, D. C., Milton and Rabbi Eliezer . . .	262
Allen, D. C., Milton and the Creation of Birds . . .	263
French, J. M., The Baptism of Milton's Daughter Mary . . .	264
Lancaster, H. C., Garrick at the Comédie Française, June 9, 1751 . . .	265

# CONTENTS

V

	PAGE
Coleman, R. A., Further Reminiscences of Walt Whitman	266
Adkins, N. F., Emerson's "Days" and Edward Young	269
Schultz, Howard, A Fragment of Jacobean Song in Thoreau's <i>Walden</i>	271
Kurrelmeyer, W., Joachim Meier's Contribution to the German Language	293
Dunbar, Viola, A Source for <i>Roderick Hudson</i>	303
Kokeritz, Helge, Chaucer's <i>Rosemounde</i>	310
Bryant, J. A., Jr., The Diet of Chaucer's Franklin	318
Dempster, Germaine, On the Significance of Hengwrt's Change of Ink in the <i>Merchant's Tale</i>	325
Weese, W. E., "Vengeance and Pleyn Correccioun," <i>KnT</i> 2461	331
Hinman, Charlton, "Nether" and "Neither" in the Seventeenth Century	333
Wilkins, E. H., Cardinal Petrus Bertrandi, Zanobi da Strada, and Petrarch	335
Singleton, C. S., <i>La Porta del piacere</i> ( <i>Paradiso</i> xi, 60)	339
Aitola, G. T. and W. A. Eichengreen, A Judeo-Portuguese Passage in the <i>Farga de Inês Pereira</i> of Gil Vicente	342
Voss, Arthur, Lowell, Hood and the Pun	346
Roppolo, J. P., The Meaning of "at erst" Prologue to "Sir Topas," B <sup>2</sup> , 1884	365
Muscatine, Charles, The Feigned Illness in Chaucer's <i>Troilus and Criseyde</i>	372
Huppé, B. F., Rape and Woman's Sovereignty in the <i>Wife of Bath's Tale</i>	378
Wretling, D. E., The Wife of Bath's Hat	381
Zeydel, E. H., An Unpublished Letter of Johann Adolf Schlegel	382
Blankenagel, J. C., A Nietzsche Episode in Thomas Mann's 'Doktor Faustus'	387
Camden, Carroll, The Suffocation of the Mother	390
Marilla, E. L., Henry Vaughan's Conversion a Recent View	394
Miller, C. William, Cowley and Evelyn's <i>Kalendarium Hortense</i>	398
Westfall, Alfred, A New American Shakespeare Allusion	401
Nearing, Homer, Jr., Caesar's Sword ( <i>Faerie Queene</i> II x. 49; <i>Love's Labour's Lost</i> v. ii. 615)	403
Lancaster, H. C., A Chinese Source for Maupassant	405
Niess, R. J., Emile Zola: from Fact to Fiction	407
Françon, Marcel, Coquilles	408
Schwartz, W. L., "Monologue intérieur" in 1845.	409
Douglas, W. W., Wordsworth in Politics: the Westmoreland Election of 1818	437
Linn, Rolf, Fontane and the German Revolution of 1848	450
Pace, G. B., Four Unpublished Chaucer Manuscripts	457
Artinian, Artine, Guy de Maupassant and Louis Le Pottevin	463
Artinian, Artine, First Publication of Maupassant's <i>Papa de Simon</i>	469
Schaffer, Aaron, A Hugo "Pastiche"	471

	PAGE
Ryland, Hobart, An Unsigned Article by Chateaubriand	472
Weese, W. E., Alceste and Joan of Kent	474
Wendell, J. P., Two 'Cruxes in the Poetry of Donne	477
Thomas, Sidney, New Light on the Nashe-Harvey Quarrel	481
Heltzel, Virgil B., Young Francis Bacon's Tutor	483
Bandy, W. T., A Sidelight on the Hume-Rousseau Quarrel	486
Porter, Kenneth, Burns and Peggy Chalmers	487
Hollingsworth, Keith, Who Suggested the Plan for Bulwer's <i>Paul Clifford</i> ?	489
Wasserman, E. R., Coleridge's "Metrical Experiments"	491
Coe, C. N., A Note on Wordsworth's "The Solitary Reaper"	493
Lancaster, H. C., The Alleged First Foreign Estimate of Shakespeare	509
Eastman, A. M., Johnson's Shakespearean Labors in 1765	512
Mossner, E. C., Dr. Johnson in <i>partibus Infidelium</i> ?	516
Vordtriede, Werner, Der Tod als ewiger Augenblick	520
Hewett-Thayer, H. W., A Source of Hoffmann's <i>Der Kampf der Sanger</i>	526
Schirokauer, Arno, Ein unbekannter hochdeutscher <i>Reinicke Fuchs</i> von 1577	528
Schirokauer, Arno, Blackwell's [Medieval] German Texts	529
Whiting, B. J., John Maxwell's <i>Sum Reasownes and Prowerbes</i>	534
Williams, Arnold, A Note on <i>Samson Agonistes</i> , Ll 90-94	537
Turner, W. A., Milton's Aid to Davenant.	538
Kelley, Maurice, The Annotations in Milton's Family Bible	539
Shanker, Sidney, "Shakespeare Pays Some Compliments"	540
Banks, T. H., Shakespeare's Sonnet No 8.	541
Sabol, A. J., An English Source for One of More's Latin Epigrams	542
Hughes, M. Y., A Boethian Parallel to <i>F. Q. I</i> , ii, 1, 2-4	543
Ames, A. C., Contemporary Defense of Wordsworth's "Pedlar,"	543
Davidson, Frank, Hawthorne's Use of a Pattern from <i>The Rambler</i>	545
Bloomfield, M. W., "Doom is Dark and Deeper Than Any Sea-Dingle"	548
Witt, Marion, A Note on Joyce and Yeats	552

## REVIEWS

S. Wilma Deierkauf-Holsboer, Vie d'Alexandre Hardy, poète du roi. Quarante-deux documents inédits. [H. C. Lancaster.]	61
A. J. Mathews, "La Wallonie," 1886-1892. The Symbolist Movement in Belgium; Anna Balakian, Literary Origins of Surrealism. A New Mysticism in French Poetry. [B. A. Morrisette.]	63
J. S. Diekhoff, Milton's "Paradise Lost": A Commentary on the Argument. [E. M. Pope.]	68
Alexander, Henry (tr.), Four Plays by Holberg, with an Introduction by O. J. Campbell. [C. K. Bang.]	70
R. M. Kain, Fabulous Vayager: James Joyce's <i>Ulysses</i> . [Richard Chase.]	72

	PAGE
Joseph Delcourt (ed.), Geoffrey Chaucer, <i>Contes de Cantorbéry</i> , Contes choisis, avec introduction grammaticale, notes et glossaire. [H. R. Patch] . . . . .	140
Charles Olson, Call Me Ishmael. [Willard Thorp.] . . . .	141
D. M. Foerster, Homer in English Criticism; The Historical Approach in the Eighteenth Century. [E. L. McAdam, Jr.] . . . .	142
D. Bush, English Literature in the Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660. [M. Y. Hughes] . . . . .	190
I. J. Semper, <i>Hamlet</i> without Tears; H. Granville-Barker, Prefaces to Shakespeare. [M. A. Shaaber] . . . . .	194
F. J. Carmody (ed.), <i>La Compilacions de le science des estoilles</i> , by Leopold of Austria. [R. Levy] . . . . .	197
A. Barbier (ed.), <i>Poèmes</i> . Par P. de Ronsard, J. Lavaud (ed.), <i>Sonnets pour Hélène</i> . Par P. de Ronsard. [M. Françon.] . . .	200
C. C. Brody, The Works of Claude Boyer [H. C. Lancaster.] . . .	202
S. D. Braun, The 'Courtisane' in the French Theatre from Hugo to Becque (1831-1885); W. D. Pendell, Victor Hugo's Acted Dramas and the Contemporary Press. [G. B. Fitch] . . . . .	204
D. C. Allen (ed.), <i>Essays</i> by Sir William Cornwallis, the Younger. [A. M. Witherspoon] . . . . .	206
H. F. Fletcher (ed.), John Milton's Complete Poetical Works. [M. Kelley] . . . . .	208
M. T. Herrick, The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1555. [V. Hall, Jr.] . . . . .	209
C. N. Greenough and J. M. French, A Bibliography of the Theophras- tian Character in English; B. Boyce, The Theophrastian Char- acter in England to 1642. [D. C. Allen.] . . . . .	211
J. Casaldurno, Jorge Guillén: <i>Cántico</i> . [R. Whittredge] . . . . .	212
B. A. Mackenzie, Shakespeare's Sonnets. [C. Hinman] . . . . .	213
K. B. Taft (ed.), Minor Knickerbockers. [H. E. Spwey.] . . . .	214
Ulrich Baumgartner, Adelbert von Chamisso's "Peter Schlemihl"; René Wehrh, Eichendorff's Erlebnis und Gestaltung der Sinnen- welt. [W. Paulsen.] . . . . .	272
Lily B. Campbell, Shakespeare's "Histories": Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy. [R. B. Heilman.] . . . . .	275
Alfred Harbage, As They Liked It, an Essay on Shakespeare and Morality. [K. O. Myrick.] . . . . .	277
Irene Samuel, Plato and Milton [J. M. French.] . . . . .	280
G. N. Ray (ed.), The Letters and Private Papers of William Make- piece Thackeray. [E. M. Everett.] . . . . .	282
W. Y. Tindall, Forces in Modern British Literature, 1885-1946. [J. H. Buckley.] . . . . .	285
Gregory Paine (ed.), Southern Prose Writers. [R. D. Jacobs.] . . .	286
Jane Lundblad, Nathaniel Hawthorne and the Tradition of the Gothic Romance. [E. W. Manwaring.] . . . . .	288
B. Boesch (ed.), Deutsche Literaturgeschichte in Grundzügen. [Arno Schirokauer.] . . . . .	348

	PAGE
James Hutton, The Greek Anthology in France and in Latin Writers of the Netherlands to the Year 1800 [ <i>R. J. Clements</i> ]	352
B. E. Young-et G. P. Young (eds.), Le Registre de La Grange, 1659-1685. [ <i>H. C. Lancaster</i> ]	356
C. D. Brenner, A Bibliographical List of Plays in the French Language 1700-1789 [ <i>H. C. Lancaster</i> ]	358
Otto Oberholzer, Richard Beer-Hofmann, Werk und Weltbild des Dichters [ <i>Sol Liptzin</i> ]	359
A. W. Brown, The Metaphysical Society. Victorian Minds in Crises, 1869-1880 [ <i>C. F. Harrold</i> ]	361
R. D. Mosier, Making the American Mind. Social and Moral Ideas in the McGuffey Readers [ <i>J. L. Blau</i> ]	362
H. M. Wolff, Heinrich von Kleist als politischer Dichter. [ <i>I. C. Blankenagel</i> ]	410
Fritz Güttinger, Die romantische Komödie und das deutsche Lustspiel, Marga Buhrig, Hebbels dramatischer Stil [ <i>Wolfgang Paulsen</i> ]	413
Paula Ritzler, Der Traum in der Dichtung der deutschen Romantik, Alfred Liebi, Das Bild der Schweiz in der deutschen Romantik [ <i>Wolfgang Paulsen</i> ]	416
Berta Berger, Der moderne deutsche Bildungsroman. [ <i>Wolfgang Paulsen</i> ]	417
Wilhelm Kosch, Deutsches Literatur-Lexikon. Biographisches und bibliographisches Handbuch [ <i>W. Kurrelmeyer</i> ]	419
L. A. Willoughby (ed.), Papers Read before the Society in 1945. [ <i>Ernst Feise</i> ]	420
Max Luthi, Das europäische Volksmärchen: Form und Wesen. [ <i>Archer Taylor</i> ]	422
G. R. Havens (ed.), Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Discours sur les Sciences et les Arts. [ <i>P. M. Spurlin</i> ]	423
Alison Fairlie, Leconte de Lisle's Poems on the Barbarian Races. [ <i>Emile Malakis</i> ]	425
E. C. Dunn, The Concept of Ingratitude in Renaissance English Moral Philosophy. [ <i>Rosemond Tuve</i> ]	427
P. L. Ralph, Sir Humphrey Mildmay. Royalist Gentleman. [ <i>G. E. Dawson</i> ]	429
E. A. Armstrong, Shakespeare's Imagination. A Study of the Psychology of Association and Inspiration. [ <i>T. P. Harrison, Jr.</i> ]	431
A. McK. Terhune, The Life of Edward FitzGerald, Translator of the <i>Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám</i> . [ <i>M. B. Smith</i> ]	432
T. W. Baldwin, Shakespeare's Five-Act Structure. [ <i>H. S. Wilson</i> ]	494
E. R. Wasserman, Elizabethan Poetry in the Eighteenth Century. Léon Lemonnier, Les Poètes Anglais du XVIII <sup>e</sup> Siècle. [ <i>B. H. Bronson</i> ]	496
Heinrich Schneider, Quest for Mysteries. The Masonic Background for Literature in Eighteenth-Century Germany. [ <i>H. M. Wolff</i> ]	500

	PAGE
H Grégoire, R Jacobson et M Szeftel (eds), assistés de J. A. Joffe, <i>Le Geste du Prince Igor</i> Epopée russe du douzième siècle [René Wellek]	502
R. H. Williams, Boccacini in Spain [V Llorens]	503
Mary Patchell, The <i>Palmerin</i> Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction [J L. Lievsay]	504
D N Smith and Cleanth Brooks (eds), The Percy Letters Cleanth Brooks (ed.), The Correspondence of Thomas Percy & Richard Farmer. [V. H. Ogburn]	506
E. De Selincourt and Helen Darbishire (eds), The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth. [R D Havens]	507
H. Kamla, Novalis' <i>Hymnen an die Nacht</i> ; M Besset, Novalis et la pensée mystique; A J. M. Bus, Der Mythos der Musik in Novalis' <i>Heinrich von Ofterdingen</i> . [L W. Kahn]	553
E A Runge, Primitivism and Related Ideas in <i>Sturm und Drang</i> Literature [B. Blume]	557
J H. W. Rosteutscher, Die Wiederkunft des Dionysos, der natur- mystische Irrationalismus in Deutschland. [R T Clark, Jr]	559
Moody Prior, The Language of Tragedy. [F S Tupper]	560
M. M. Fitzgerald, First Follow Nature Primitivism in English Poetry, 1725-1750. [R. H. Pearce]	562
W L Payne, Mr. Review: Daniel Defoe as Author of "The Review." [A W Secord]	564
F W. Boege, Smollett's Reputation as a Novelist. [L L Martz]	565
F. E L Priestley (ed), William Godwin, <i>Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and Its Influence on Morals and Happiness</i> . [A O Aldridge]	567
A L Strout, John Bull's Letter to Lord Byron. [S C. Chew]	568
A. M. D. Hughes, The Nascent Mind of Shelley. [F L. Jones]	569
Joseph Barrell, Shelley and the Thought of His Time [Carlos Baker.]	571
F. L. Jones (ed), Mary Shelley's Journal. [Elizabeth Nitchie.]	572
J. V. Logan, Wordsworthian Criticism, a Guide and Bibliography. [R D. Havens.]	574
Andrew Hilen, Longfellow and Scandinavia. [Stefán Einarsson.]	575
C. F Harrold (ed.), J. H. Newman, <i>Apologia pro Vita Sua, The Idea of a University, A Grammar of Assent</i> . [W E. Houghton]	576
H H Hudson, The Epigram in the English Renaissance. [Leicester Bradner]	577
Herbert Davis, <i>The Satire of Jonathan Swift</i> . [R. Quintana]	578

BRIEF MENTION

R W Short (ed.), Four Great American Novels [Christof Wegelm.]	143
H. H Clark and Norman Foerster (eds.), James Russell Lowell [R. C Beatty]	215
M-L Dufrenoy, L'Orient romanesque en France 1704-1789. T. II. [Emile Malakis.]	216

	PAGE
A. Gillies (ed.), Johann Gottfried Herder, <i>Journal meiner Reise im Jahre 1769</i> [Ernst Feise]	289
E. De Selincourt, Wordsworthian and Other Studies. [R. D. Havens.]	290
Me Tsung Kaung Tang, William Crary Brownell, Literary Adviser. [Norman Foerster]	290
Hugh Macdonald (ed.), <i>Poems</i> , by Richard Leigh. [D. C. Allen]	291
E. F. Rogers (ed.), The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More [D. C. Allen.]	291
The International Who's Who. [H. C. Lancaster.]	291
A. J. Denomy, The Heresy of Courtly Love [Sidney Painter]	303
Alfred Loewenberg, Early Dutch librettos and plays with music in the British Museum. [L. M. Price]	364
A. J. F. Zieglschmid, Das Klein-Geschichtsbuch der Hutterischen Bruder [Arno Schirokauer.]	434
P. S. Conklin, A History of Hamlet Criticism [D. C. Allen]	434
Virgil Heltzel (ed.), Robert Ashley, <i>Of Honour</i> . [D. C. Allen.]	435
Tucker Brooke, Essays on Shakespeare. [D. C. Allen.]	435
J. W. H. Atkins, English Literary Criticism: The Renaissance. [D. C. Allen.]	508
H. Sparnaay, Karl Lachmann als Germanist. [Arno Schirokauer.]	579
M. R. Adams, Studies in the Literary Backgrounds of English Radicalism [T. M. Raysor.]	580

## CORRESPONDENCE

H. C. Lancaster, The Birth Date of Lord Herbert of Cherbury	144
J. U. Rundle, Footnote on Calderón, Ravenscroft, and Boursault	217
H. C. Lancaster, Reply	219
M. E. Storer, Mme de Villegieu's <i>Nouvelles africaines</i>	292
C. M. Syford, Merce non Mercede	435
J. C. Maxwell, Whetstone and Marlowe	436
William Elton, "Sooth" in Shakespeare, Milton, and Keats	436

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume LXIII

JANUARY, 1948

Number 1

---

## ANGLIAN AND SAXON ELEMENTS IN WULFSTAN'S VOCABULARY

Students of the Old English prose vocabulary have concluded that Archbishop Wulfstan used both Anglian and Saxon words freely in his sermons. Gunther Scherer, in his dissertation on the Anglian vocabulary of Werferth's translation of Gregory's *Dialogues*, reported that Wulfstan used such characteristically Anglian words as *fracoð*, n., 'insult,' 'wickedness', *geornes*, 'desire', *herenes*, 'praise', *hlēopran*, 'sound,' 'resound'; *semnunga*, 'suddenly'; *þrēodian*, 'hesitate'; *winnan* in the sense of 'labor,' 'toil'; and at the same time such specifically Saxon words as *hrēowsung*, 'repentance'; *rihtlæcan*, 'correct', and *witegung*, 'prophecy.'<sup>1</sup> Scherer therefore called Wulfstan a man of mixed speech and said he could be considered neither pure Saxon nor pure Anglian.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, Hildegard Rauh, in her dissertation on the vocabulary of the Late West Saxon *Gospel of Matthew*,<sup>3</sup> found Wulfstan's vocabulary mixed, listing 11 Anglian and 46 Saxon words, 21 of them both Early and Late West Saxon and 25 limited to Late West Saxon.<sup>4</sup> She also listed three questionably Anglian words and 13

<sup>1</sup> *Zur Geographie und Chronologie des angelsächsischen Wortschatzes im Anschluss an Bischof Waerferth's Übersetzung der "Dialoge" Gregors* (Leipzig, 1928), pp. 41-42, where these words are listed without the definitions given in the first part of the book. Scherer points out that all but two of the Anglian words, *fracoð* and *þrēodian*, are used once exceptionally in Saxon or LWS texts, p. 41.

<sup>2</sup> P. 42.

<sup>3</sup> *Der Wortschatz der altenglischen Uebersetzungen des Matthaeus-Evangeliums untersucht auf seine dialektische und zeitliche Gebundenheit*. Berlin, 1936.

<sup>4</sup> Rauh, p. 47. The Anglian words will be listed below.



questionably West Saxon, 9 early and late and 4 late only. The conclusions of both these writers are invalidated by their failure to distinguish Wulfstan's genuine homilies from the spurious ones printed in Napier's collection.<sup>5</sup> Napier's own list of spurious homilies<sup>6</sup> has now been greatly enlarged by the studies of other scholars, notably, J. P. Kinard, Richard Becher, and Karl Jost.<sup>7</sup> Miss Dorothy Whitelock, the latest scholar to write on the subject, considers the following English homilies genuine II, III, V, VI, X, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI (except for the passage from p. 98, line 5, to p. 101, line 5), XVII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXVIII, XXXII, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXVII (in MS. E), and LIV.<sup>8</sup> Professor Dorothy Bethurum, who is preparing an edition of Wulfstan's genuine homilies, includes VII (a revision of a homily by Ælfric which appears as no. VIII in Napier's collection),<sup>9</sup> XV, and XLI, and I therefore consider them genuine. The spurious homilies or those for which there is no evidence of Wulfstan's authorship are: I, VIII (Ælfric's), XVIII (a revision of Ælfric), XXIII-XXVII, XXIX-XXXI, XXXV-XXXVI, XXXVIII-XL, XLII-LIII, LV-LXII.

<sup>5</sup> Arthur Napier, *Wulfstan, Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit, Erste Abteilung Text und Varianten*, Berlin, 1883. Both Scheier and Miss Rauh use Loring H. Dodd's *Glossary of Wulfstan's Homilies, Yale Studies in English*, xxxv (New York, 1908), which is a glossary of all the homilies printed in Napier's *Wulfstan* and makes no attempt to distinguish occurrences in genuine homilies from those in spurious.

<sup>6</sup> *Wulfstan*, p. viii, where Napier writes that VIII and XVIII are Ælfric's, as is also LVII in large part; XXIX borrows largely from the poem *Be Domes Dæge* (*Judgment Day* II), and XLIX from *Blickling Homily* IX. Napier had noted in his dissertation, *Über die Werke des altenglischen Erzbischofs Wulfstan* (Weimar, 1882), p. 8, that the majority of the homilies attributed to Wulfstan by Wanley were not genuine, but he never published the second volume of his edition, in which he planned to discuss the authorship of the homilies.

<sup>7</sup> J. P. Kinard, *A Study of Wulfstan's Homilies: their style and sources* (Baltimore, 1897), Richard Becher, *Wulfstans Homilien*, Leipzig, 1910, Karl Jost, 'Einige Wulfstantexte und ihre Quellen,' *Anglia* LVI (1932), 265-315.

<sup>8</sup> *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* (London, 1939), pp. 13-14. II and IX the Latin originals of V and X, are also Wulfstan's, as Jost showed, pp. 268-288.

<sup>9</sup> Miss Whitelock, p. 14, note 2, merely says that VII and XVIII are revisions of Ælfric, but Miss Bethurum, following Becher (p. 49), considers VII a revision by Wulfstan of Ælfric's homily on the seven-fold gifts of the Holy Ghost, and finds no evidence of Wulfstan's hand in XVIII.

Of the seven Anglian words listed by Scherer as occurring in Wulfstan, five are in spurious homilies only: *geornes* in LVI (290.31); *herenes* in XLIX (265.14); *hlēopruð* in XL (182.10); *semninga* in XLIX (262.7) and *prēodian*, in XXIX (only in the verbal noun *priding*, 140.13). As a noun, *fracod*, *fracod*, 'insult,' 'wickedness,' seems to be found only in Anglian,<sup>10</sup> although the adjective is Common Old English: the noun occurs in VII (54.7), which Miss Bethurum considers Wulfstan's revision of Ælfric's homily on the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Ghost, as well as in the spurious XLVI (240.24). *Winnan* was shown by Wildhagen to be Anglian in the sense of 'labor,' 'toil,' and the corresponding noun *gewinn*, 'labor,' likewise,<sup>11</sup> but though Scherer lists *winnan* as an instance of an Anglian usage in Wulfstan, all the instances in the genuine homilies and elsewhere in the volume seem to have only the Common Old English senses of 'strive,' 'contend,' 'fight.'<sup>12</sup> The noun *gewinn* occurs in the sense of 'labor,' 'toil,' in the spurious XLIX (259.24) only; in the genuine homily XIV (89.5) it has the usual sense of 'strife'. On the other hand, of the three Saxon words noted by Scherer, two occur in both genuine and spurious homilies: *hrēowsung*, 'repentance,' in genuine XXXII (155.23); cf. *behrēowsung* in genuine III (24.18); and *witegung*, 'prophecy,' in genuine VII (51.2). The third word, *rihtlācan*, 'correct,' is found only in spurious homilies: XXXVIII (174.30/175.1) and LIII (277.2). Thus if one excludes the spurious homilies Scherer's list of 9 Anglian words used by Wulfstan is reduced to one, and his list of four Saxon words to two.

Miss Rauh's list of Anglian words used by Wulfstan consists of *andgietan*, 'perceive'; *æswic*, 'offence,' 'stumbling-block'; *beþeccan*, 'cover'; *geāra*, 'formerly'; *morþor*, 'murder'; *ofniman*, 'take away'; *þēofend*, 'theft'; *unmanig*, 'few'; *unwæstm*, 'barrenness,' 'infertility of soil,' 'weed'; *ymbtýnan*, 'surround,' 'enclose.' Without considering at the moment whether all these are indisputably Anglian, we may exclude at once those that are found only in spurious homilies: *andgietan*, XLIV (221.18, 21); *beþeccan*,

<sup>10</sup> Scherer, pp 13-14.

<sup>11</sup> *Der Psalter des Eadwine von Canterbury*, Morsbach's *Studien zur englischen Philologie* 13 (Halle, 1905), pp. 184-86

<sup>12</sup> The instances in the genuine homilies are: XXXI (86.7), XIV (89.9), XV (92.2, 13, 15, 17, 18), XIX (109.8).

xxx (148.33), xlix (263.16/17); *geāra*, xliii (206.6, 213.3); *ofnman*, xlv (231.15); *þeofend*, xlix (253.8, 255.11); *unmanig*, xliv (215.20/21)<sup>13</sup>; and *ymbtȳnan*, xxx (146.27).<sup>13</sup> This leaves only three instances of Anglian words occurring in genuine homilies: *æswic* in xxxiii (164.3), *morþor* in genuine v (40.7) and xxii (115.8), as well as four times in spurious homilies;<sup>14</sup> and *unwæstm* in the genuine xxviii (133.6) as well as four times in spurious homilies.<sup>15</sup> Of *æswic*, which translates *scandalum* in the Rushworth I Matthew 18.7, where the Late West Saxon Gospel has *swicdōm*, Ælfric's usual word, I may remark that though Ælfric avoids *æswic* he uses the verb *æswician* at least four times.<sup>16</sup> *Morþor* was called 'not WS' by Sweet in his *Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon* (1897), and is avoided by Alfred and Ælfric, who use *morþ* or *manslht*. It is used often in the poetry and the instances in homilies v and xxii both occur in passages where Wulfstan is using a series of alliterative doublets, which include *morðres oððon manslhtes* (*morðor and manslhtas*). In similar fashion, *unwæstm*, which is used in an alliterative phrase with *unwider* (*unweder*) three times in spurious homilies,<sup>17</sup> is used once in the same kind of phrase in genuine homily xxviii (133.6: *unwæstm þurh unweder*). The three 'questionably' Anglian words which Miss Rauh finds in Wulfstan are. *gereordian*, 'to feed'; *weorcman*, 'laborer', and *wreon*, 'to cover.'<sup>18</sup> Of these words *gereordian* is evidently listed by error, for it is included in the list of words that give no result,<sup>19</sup> and is actually found in Ælfric with some frequency,<sup>20</sup> *Weorcman* and *wreon* are in the

<sup>13</sup> *Ymbsellan*, 'surround,' included in Miss Rauh's list of Wulfstan's Anglian words, does not occur at 226.2 as reported by her, p. 16, nor is it in Dodd's glossary.

<sup>14</sup> xl (187.18, 188.14), xlix (253.7), lvi (290.26).

<sup>15</sup> xxvii (129.5), xxxv (170.1), l (268.24, 271.3).

<sup>16</sup> *Cath. Hom.* I, 514.3, 516.1; II, 563.24; *Lives of Saints* 11.42

<sup>17</sup> *Unwidera for oft weolden unwæstma*, xxvii (129.4/5), l (268.24); *unwæstm oþþon unweder*, xxxv (170.1); cf. *miswydera oððon unwæstmas*, l (271.3).

<sup>18</sup> P. 47.

<sup>19</sup> P. 64. This list includes those words that can be assigned neither to Saxon nor Anglian territory

<sup>20</sup> *Cath. Hom.* I, 296.24; 458.18; II, 218.29; 590.25, and the further references in Bosworth-Toller. Alfred seems to use the form *gereordan*, wk 1, past part. *gereord*, *Past. Care* 137.24, 283.12.

list of 'fraglich' words that are recorded as Anglian with one exception<sup>21</sup> In any case none of the three has any importance in establishing an Anglian element in Wulfstan's vocabulary: all three occur only in spurious homilies.<sup>22</sup>

Since Scherer's lists are based on Gregory's *Dialogues* and omit words that happen to occur only in other Anglian texts and since Miss Rauh's lists are avowedly limited to the vocabulary of the West Saxon *Gospel of Matthew* and the corresponding words in the Northumbrian and Mercian gospels, I have looked through Jordan's index of Anglian words to see whether any not included by Scherer and Miss Rauh are found in the Wulfstan volume. Many of the words thus gleaned could hardly be considered good tests of Anglian origin, being mentioned by Jordan only incidentally or in foot-notes, but in order not to minimize the possible Anglian elements I included even words like 'frinan,' 'befrinan,' which are merely obsolescent in Late West Saxon, and were actually used by both Alfred and Ælfric. Of the nine possible Anglianisms eight occur in spurious homilies.<sup>23</sup> *Oferhoga*, 'proud man,' 'despiser,'

<sup>21</sup> P 25 A 'questionably' Anglian word, *wīa*, noun, 'militia,' 'misfortune,' 'evil,' included like *wreōn* and *weorcman* in Miss Rauh's list of words recorded as Anglian with one exception (p 24, the exception here being *Boethius* 118 23), is omitted from her list of such words used by Wulfstan, probably by error, but perhaps because of doubts of the value of this word as a test Of the six instances four occur in spurious homilies (*wīana*, XXIX, 139 2, *wīa*, XL, 188 1; XLIV, *wēan*, 217 33, *wēana*, XLIV, 226 6). Of the two instances in genuine homilies one occurs in VII (51 25), which is a revision of Ælfric's VIII, though this passage does not appear in VIII, and the second in XXVIII (133 3) in the form *wāwa*, which may be a different word, as Holthausen, *Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, assumes, and is certainly familiar enough to the Saxons to be used three times by Ælfric, *Cath Hom* I, 17.158; 23 124, 186; see Bosworth-Toller, *Suppl*

<sup>22</sup> *Gereordian*, LV (285 25, 288 14), LVI (293.27), LVII (293.27); *weorcman*, L (267 14), *wreōn*, XLVI (240 22)

<sup>23</sup> The words are: *ārcæfnan*, 'carry out,' 'endure,' Jordan, p 88, note 1: XLIII (207.24), but this word is a doubtful Anglianism because of the instances cited from Ælfric by B-T; *bealu*, n., a poeticism which J, p. 74, calls 'ganz unsicher,' XL (186.11, 188.2); cf. *bealu*, adj XXX (145 18), and *bealubend*, XXXVIII (178.2), both spurious, and *unbealuful*, 'innocent,' in XIII (83.13), genuine, *gefēon*, 'to rejoice,' found in Alfred but supplanted by *(ge)fægman* in LWS, J., pp 89-90, XLIX (265 12); *frinan*, J, p 94, in XLIV (220 14). *befrinan* XXXI (152.23); *frympelic*, 'initial,' J. 61, note 2, XLIX (252.12); *hlēoprian*, 'poetical-Anglian,' J., p. 43 and note 3, XL

on the other hand, occurs in two spurious and two genuine homilies.<sup>24</sup> Jordan lists this with *hoga*, adj., 'prudent,' which he considers specifically Northumbrian as opposed to the Common Old English abstract noun *hoga*, 'sorrow,' 'care.'<sup>25</sup> The compound *oferhoga*, probably a secondary formation from *oferhogian*, 'to despise,' he found only in the *Vespasian Psalter*, the Wulfstan volume, and in the *Institutes of Polity*.<sup>26</sup>

Since only a little over one-third of the material in Napier's Wulfstan volume is genuine, many of Miss Rauh's 47 Saxon and 13 questionably Saxon words naturally appear in spurious homilies only, but the list of Saxon words in genuine homilies remains considerable: 11 that are both early and late West Saxon, 9 Late West Saxon; 8 questionably early and late West Saxon and 2 questionably Late West Saxon. Even some of the words not questioned by Miss Rauh seem to me doubtful as tests of Saxon origin. I shall therefore disregard those that she herself considers 'fraglich.' The West Saxon words that are both early and late are: *ætsacan*, 'to deny,' XIII (85.1); XVI (97.3), *behātan*, 'promise,' 'vow,' V (37.13, 38.7, 19, 39.2), X (67.7, 71.6, 75.15); XIX (110.1); XXXIV (167.1); XXXV (172.13); *fordēman*, 'condemn,' X (70.8); *forþfaran* 'depart,' 'die,' II (16.15); *gehende*, adv., prep., 'near,' 'at hand,'<sup>27</sup> X (75.8); XII (79.12); XIII (83.9), XIV (89.8); *leorningcniht*, 'disciple,' II (17.10); III (20.17, 21.5); *manslht*, 'manslaughter,' V (40.7); X (69.20); XXXII (115.9); XXXIII (164.4); *offrung*, 'oblation,' LIV (280.22);

(182.10); *semnunga*, J, p. 61, Anglian but borrowed by Ælfric as a poeticism XLIX (262.7). *Sōpfæst*, which J., p. 43 and note 1, considers Anglian in the sense of 'righteous,' 'just,' as opposed to 'truthful,' 'upright,' occurs in the spurious I (22.3), XXX (146.5) and XL (184.5), and perhaps in the genuine XIX (109.12), where the meaning is not clear; but this is not significant, since Ælfric also borrows this Anglian sense (J, *ibid.*). The Anglian-poetical form *sigor*, J, p. 106, appears in a spurious homily, XLII (199.17). Even though most of these words are not exclusively Anglian, it is significant that such predominantly Anglian words are avoided in the genuine homilies.

<sup>24</sup> Spurious: XXXVII (177.11, not MS E), LV (309.28); genuine: XV (92.16), XXXIII (164.12).

<sup>25</sup> P. 36.

<sup>26</sup> The passage in the *Institutes of Polity*, ed. Thorpe (1840) p. 424, is the same as that in the pseudo-Wulfstan XXXVII (177.11).

<sup>27</sup> For *gehende* see my discussion in *PMLA* LXII (1947), 595.

*slāw*, 'sluggish,' 'lazy,' x (72.14); *swīcdōm*, 'deceit,' 'fraud,' vi (46.24); vii (52.26, 31); xxxiii (164.2); *wipūtan*, adv., 'without,' vii (51.28). The list of Late West Saxon words is: *ādrēdan*, 'dread,' xxxvii (179.16); *begieman*, 'look after,' xli (190.21); *bepeācan*, 'deceive,' ii (11.9); xiii (84.19); xv (88.26), *cynhelm*, 'diadem,' v (36.18, 22), *eornostlice*, 'truly,' v (37.12); *fjylþ*, 'filth,' 'uncleanness,' xxii (115.10); *lagu*, 'law,' ii (13.4); v (38.21); viii (56.4), x (67.3, 74.8), *gesibsumian*, 'to reconcile,' liv (278.7), *wāfels*, 'garment,' x (74.4); *wiperræde*, 'opposed,' 'perverse,' vii (52.10, 53.7), xv (92.1). None of these words is found in any of the chief Anglian monuments, the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, the Northumbrian and Mercian *Rushworth Gospels*, the *Durham Ritual*, or the *Vespasian Psalter*; but they are not all equally good witnesses to West Saxon origin. One may suspect that the dialectal limitation is sometimes an accident in the case of words that appear in Anglian with the same stem but different prefixes. It seems venturesome to list *fordēman* as West Saxon, when *fordēmedness*, 'condemnation,' appears both in Werferth's translation of Gregory's *Dialogues* and in the originally Mercian translation of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*.<sup>28</sup> *Offrung* does not appear in Anglian texts, but the verb *offrian*, 'to vow,' occurs four times in the Mercian *Vespasian Psalter*.<sup>29</sup> *Slāw* is not a common word in Old English, but *unslāw* appears in the Anglian poetry.<sup>30</sup> In spite of some uncertainties there can be no doubt that the Saxon element is very strong and much more characteristic than the rather colorless Anglian element. Although Miss Rauh included some doubtful words in her lists, she also, because of the limits of her study, fails to list other Saxon words in Wulfstan, words, that is, which do not happen to occur in the Gospels. Though I have not made an exhaustive search it seems likely that one could find

<sup>28</sup> *Dialogues* 345.3 (ed. H. Hecht); Bede I, 6. 19 1/2 (ed J Schipper), both cited by B-T and *Suppl Fordēman* itself appears in the *Blickling Homilies* (v, 63.11, vii, 87.2, xviii 223.32), which are strongly Anglian in vocabulary. Miss Rauh finds an admixture of Saxon words in the *Blickling Homilies*; but her evidence consists of rather doubtful words, including *cynhelm*, 'diadem,' and *intō*; cf. note 34 below on *geferræden* and *gestrēwian*.

<sup>29</sup> 65.15, 87.30, 71.10, 75.12.

<sup>30</sup> *Elene* 202, *Andreas* 1711. *Guthlac* (II) 950, and perhaps even *Beowulf* 2564 (MS *ungleaw*).

genuine Saxonisms to replace all the words in Miss Rauh's lists that seem doubtful. Thus the characteristic West Saxon *ēaðmētto* occurs in II (16.19) as opposed to the Anglian form *ēaðmēdu* in the spurious XXIX (134.13,15);<sup>31</sup> West Saxon *orþian*, 'to breathe,' occurs twice in V (33.18, 36.4) and *orþung* once (36.3), not the Anglian *ēþian*, *ēþung*,<sup>32</sup> and the characteristic West Saxon *gescēadwīsnēs* also occurs in the same homily (35.14)

The Anglian element in Wulfstan's own sermons thus turns out to be very small and the Saxon element comparatively large. The few Anglian words are easily explained by the preacher's search for fine phrases or by his imitation of earlier homilists. Every one of them would be easily grasped by educated listeners in Saxon territory. The converse is certainly not true. There is nothing in his vocabulary to indicate that he was other than Saxon born and trained. In recent years the large Anglian element in Ælfric's vocabulary has been emphasized,<sup>33</sup> and though this has been much exaggerated,<sup>34</sup> it is probable that Ælfric did sometimes borrow words that were chiefly used in the Anglian *Kirchsprache*. Wulfstan might easily have enriched his vocabulary with similar borrowings, but the fact is that the admixture of Anglian elements in his homilies is so small as to be practically negligible.

It is of some interest that many of the Anglian words which misled Scherer and Miss Rauh into overestimating the Anglian element in Wulfstan are to be found clustered in particular spurious homilies. Homily XLIX, for instance, which is well known because of its eloquent passage on death and the decay of earthly splendors, and the beginning of which is paralleled in *Blückling Homily IX*,<sup>35</sup> has *beþeccan*, *frympelic*, 'initial,' *gewinn*, 'toil,' *herenes*, *þeofend*, *semninga*, and the more uncertain *gefēon*, 'rejoice,' rare in Late West Saxon, and *morþor*.<sup>36</sup> This collection would be enough to

<sup>31</sup> On *ēaðmētto*, see *PMLA* LXII (1947), 587 and n. 18.

<sup>32</sup> Jordan, pp. 54-55

<sup>33</sup> Paul Meissner, 'Studien zum Wortschatz Ælfrics,' *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* 165 (1934), 11-19, 166 (1934/35), 30-39, 205-215.

<sup>34</sup> See my strictures in *PMLA* LXII (1947), 584-585.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Napier, *Wulfstan*, p. viii.

<sup>36</sup> Jordan, p. 61 and footnote 2, pointed out that this homily contained Anglian traits, noting *semninga*, 262.7, 11, *sōþfæst*, 'righteous,' 256.8, 18; *morþor*, 253.7; *gefēon*, 265.12; the Anglian formation *mishērnēs*, 'dis-

warrant the assumption of Anglian origin if it were not for the curious fact that the homily also contains at least four of Miss Rauh's Saxon words *ætbregdan*, 'to take away,' (259.25), *gefërræden*, 'ecclesia,' 'congregation' (256.11, 265.10); *gestrewian*, 'strew' (263.6), and *ymbhýdig*, 'anxious,' 'careful' (253.16). If these Saxonisms of Miss Rauh were to be trusted, the language of XLIX would be much more 'mixed' than that of any of the genuine homilies. The Saxon element would then have to be explained as a result of copying from Anglian into Saxon or as a deliberate use for rhetorical purposes of words characteristic of the two dialects. The first possibility is illustrated by the presence in MS. D of the characteristic Anglian *āfirran* (*āfyrrre*) for *ætbregdan* (*ætbreðe*) of the other MSS, a fact that suggests that some of the Saxonisms may have been substituted for original Anglian words when the MSS. were copied into their present Late West Saxon form. I am not convinced, however, of the validity or the significance of these Saxonisms. *Ymbhýdig* occurs in the translation of Bede, earlier version,<sup>37</sup> as Miss Rauh fails to note, and is therefore likely to have been Mercian as well as Saxon. *Gefërræden* is a technical word easily borrowed in the *Kirchsprache*, and *gestrewian* is found in an alliterative phrase with *gestrēded*.<sup>38</sup> Another homily, XL, has *gewinn*, 'toil,' *hlēoprian*, *morþor* and frequent *in* for *on*, as Jordan noted, remarking that it must have had a poetic-Anglian source.<sup>39</sup> Thus both XL and XLIX have words that point to Anglian originals. In the other spurious homilies the Anglian element is not sufficiently concentrated to be significant.

ROBERT J. MENNER

*Yale University*

obedience,' 256.4, and *frympelic*, 252.12. *Beþeccan*, Anglian-poetical, occurs 263.17, *gewinn*, 'toil,' 259.24; *herenes* 265.14; *þeofend*, 253.8, 255.11.

<sup>37</sup> Bede iv, 3 355.19/20 (ed. Schipper)

<sup>38</sup> *Gefërræden* occurs twice in *Blackling Homily* XVIII, 211.3, 213.3, and *gestrewian* twice in BH VI, 71.8/9. See note 28, above.

<sup>39</sup> P. 43, note 2.



## LA VIE THÉÂTRALE A PARIS DE 1612 A 1614

La liste des baux de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne précédée d'une explication<sup>1</sup> détaillée qui fut publiée, il y a une vingtaine d'années, donne fortement l'impression que la vie théâtrale à Paris aurait continué à se développer d'une façon tout à fait normale, dans les années 1612, 1613 et 1614. Valleran le Conte et sa troupe jouent, dans la salle de la rue Mauconseil, du 1er août 1611 au jour de carême-prenant 1612; le 9 mars, Valleran et le comédien italien Jehan Paul Alfieri louent ensemble ce même théâtre, du 8 mars à la veille du dimanche de la Passion 1612. Quelques mois plus tard, le 4 août, les comédiens du roi, sous la direction de Robert Guérin, s'engagent à y représenter des pièces en novembre et en décembre 1612. Après un intervalle de près de neuf mois, intervalle qui n'a rien de surprenant étant donné que les acteurs font souvent des tournées en province, les comédiens italiens commandés par Tristano Martinelli, dit Arlequin, s'installent à l'Hôtel de Bourgogne pour plus de huit mois; à peine ceux-ci ont-ils quitté les lieux que des comédiens du roi, dont seul le nom d'Estienne de Ruffin a été mentionné, les remplacent et exercent leur art du 27 juin au 30 septembre 1614.

Considérée en soi cette énumération des locataires successifs de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne ne pourrait, en effet, fournir une autre conclusion. Mais en rapprochant les données exposées plus haut de celles connues actuellement sur le théâtre à Paris de 1610 à 1612,<sup>2</sup> les "Lettres de rémission" du 14 septembre 1613, publiées par Campardon,<sup>3</sup> y comprises, il devient évident que l'impression laissée par les baux concernant l'état du théâtre à Paris ne peut être conforme à la réalité. Alors il est hors de doute que deux faits de nature différente ont arrêté l'évolution de la vie théâtrale dans la capitale et que pendant deux ans et trois mois les représentations françaises à Paris ont été inexistantes.

Le premier fait a été l'échec de Valleran le Conte et de son poète à gages, Alexandre Hardy. Durant six années ceux-ci s'étaient démenés pour transformer les Parisiens en partisans du théâtre

<sup>1</sup> J. Fransen, "Documents inédits," *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, 1927, p. 321.

<sup>2</sup> Voir notre *Vie d'Alexandre Hardy*, Philadelphia, American Philosophical Society, 1947.

<sup>3</sup> *Les comédiens du roi de la troupe française*, Paris, 1879, p. 279 et 280.

nouveau, mais tous ces efforts, voire même les privations endurées par eux pour atteindre leur but, sont demeurés vains. A cette époque les spectateurs assistant aux représentations de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne—et se composant presque exclusivement de gens du peuple—n'étaient pas saisis d'admiration devant les tragédies, tragico-comédies, comédies et pastorales de l'auteur dramatique. Les acteurs jouaient devant les banquettes. Même la dernière invention de Valleran le Conte, les représentations bilingues, données par sa troupe et une compagnie italienne ayant pour chef Alfieri, n'avait pas réussi à produire le succès. La grande salle de la rue Mauconseil demeurait vide. Il devint impossible à la troupe de poursuivre son travail faute de recettes suffisantes. Valleran le Conte était criblé de dettes. La débâcle s'annonçait comme inévitable. Au printemps de l'année 1612, Valleran, ses comédiens et leur poète attitré cessèrent définitivement leurs représentations à l'Hôtel de Bourgogne.

L'échec de ce chef de troupe infatigable ne manquant ni d'énergie, ni d'habileté a vivement découragé les acteurs. Nombreux étaient ceux qui, dans les premières années de l'activité de Valleran à Paris, avaient pris la route vers la capitale. Ce directeur n'avait eu souvent que l'embarras du choix pour constituer ses troupes. Aussi lorsque quelques membres de sa compagnie mécontents des résultats obtenus communiquent à Valleran que celui-ci n'aura plus à compter sur leur collaboration à l'issue du bail de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne, le jour de carême prenant 1608, il est, dès le premier décembre 1607, en mesure de former une autre troupe de comédiens qui s'acquittera, dans quelques mois, des rôles confiés aux éléments déserteurs. Mais cet état de choses n'a pas duré. Le manque de succès des poèmes dramatiques d'Alexandre Hardy à Paris et les recettes insuffisantes qui en résultaient nécessairement ne cessaient pas de livrer les acteurs les uns après les autres au désespoir, de sorte qu'ils en arrivaient soit à renoncer définitivement à leur profession de comédien, soit à tenter leur chance en province. Ce changement avait commencé à se produire à la fin de l'année 1610, quand Nicolas Gasteau d'abord, le couple Mathieu Lefebvre, dit Laporte, et Marie Venier ensuite se dissocient de la troupe. Ces derniers en avaient pardessus la tête de cette lutte continuelle. Leur exemple ne manquait pas d'être suivi; immédiatement après les trois acteurs susmentionnés, cinq autres membres, François de Vautrel, Estienne de

Ruffin, Hugues Guéru, Robert Guérin et Loys Neyer quittèrent la compagnie. Quatre de ces comédiens—Robert Guérin n'était pas des leurs—jointes à quelques autres constituèrent une nouvelle troupe dont la direction fut confiée à François de Vautrel, Paris qui n'appréciait aucunement leurs travaux, qui ne leur donnait pas de quoi vivre, est abandonné et, probablement au printemps de l'année 1611, ils s'établirent à Toulouse. A ce moment-là Valleran était toujours en état de combler les vides survenus dans sa compagnie par d'autres acteurs, Jehan le Gracieux, Sidrac Petit-Jehan, Claude Husson, sieur de Longueval, Guillaume Desforges, Jacques Mabilie et . . . Alexandre Hardy (!) se mettaient tous à la disposition de ce chef remarquable, néanmoins . . . les départs de Paris se succèdent. Les deux premiers comédiens que nous venons de nommer quittent de bonne heure la partie; les trois acteurs restants assistèrent avec Nicolas Gasteau, Rachel Trépeau et Savinien Bon à la débâcle survenue au début de 1612. Il ne leur en fallait pas plus, profondément désillusionnés ils délaissèrent leur directeur et son poète à gages, ils s'enfuirent de Paris qui leur avait fait endurer trop de misères, nous ignorons dans quels endroits ils s'arrêtèrent; ce ne sera que plusieurs années plus tard qu'ils se risqueront de nouveau à Paris. Quand Valleran le Conte forme ensuite une nouvelle troupe, le 31 mars 1612, avec laquelle il commence sa grande tournée qui le conduira en 1613 à La Haye et à Leyde, Paris est totalement sans comédiens. L'Hôtel de Bourgogne est fermé et il n'y a aucun espoir de voir ses portes se rouvrir bientôt. Il n'est plus question de représentations théâtrales dans la capitale. Voilà la situation après l'échec de Valleran le Conte et d'Alexandre Hardy!

Naturellement l'on ne peut se résigner à cet arrêt de la vie théâtrale à Paris. La capitale du royaume de France où le roi aimait à résider privée de comédiens du roi! Il fallait intervenir de manière ou d'autre.

Les Confrères de la Passion en ont-ils pris l'initiative? S'inquiéter outre mesure de la fermeture temporaire de leur salle de théâtre n'était pas dans leurs habitudes; cela n'arrivait-il pas souvent? Les troupes de comédiens qui louaient régulièrement l'Hôtel de Bourgogne, alternaient fréquemment leur séjour à Paris avec des voyages en province; et lorsqu'une compagnie d'acteurs quittait la capitale après l'expiration d'un bail, la place demeurée vacante de la sorte n'était jamais prise immédiatement par une nouvelle troupe. Parfois quelques mois s'écoulaient avant de voir

de nouveaux intéressés s'adresser aux Maîtres et Gouverneurs. Dans cet intervalle, la rue Mauconseil semblait déserte et abandonnée, le grand local du No 16 avait l'aspect d'une demeure inhabitée.

Cette fois-ci cependant les Confrères avaient de légitimes raisons pour s'inquiéter de la fermeture de leur salle. En effet, Valleran le Conte en avait été à peu près le seul locataire pendant six années. Obtenir de lui le paiement de la location cela n'avait pas toujours été facile, mais les bailleurs étaient passés maîtres dans l'art de forcer des débiteurs récalcitrants à s'acquitter de leur loyer. En outre ils avaient pris, surtout dans les dernières années, les comédiens ayant toujours de plus grandes difficultés à surmonter, la précaution d'exiger une caution et ainsi ils n'avaient jamais perdu un seul des deniers dus par Valleran. Au total ce chef avait payé aux Confrères une somme dépassant sept mille livres tournois. Les voilà privés de ces ressources importantes et cela même sans le moindre espoir de trouver d'autres locataires pour leur salle. Compter sur un retour à bref délai des comédiens absolument découragés était se repaître de chimères.

Nous ne savons pas si c'est vraiment grâce à l'intervention des Confrères de la Passion que des mesures seront prises. Il n'est pas certain non plus que le public inconstant et indécis dont l'attitude indifférente avait entraîné la fermeture de la salle de la rue Mauconseil, avait entre temps changé d'opinion en exigeant sa réouverture. L'unique fait connu est que le roi lui-même a pris la défense du théâtre français à Paris en rappelant vers la capitale pour y donner des représentations à l'Hôtel de Bourgogne la seule troupe dont le lieu de séjour était connu à ce moment-là et dont le talent avait déjà fait ses preuves : la compagnie de François de Vautrel à Toulouse.

Après avoir reçu cet ordre royal, la troupe commence naturellement aussitôt ses préparatifs pour se dépêcher vers Paris. Le chef part en avant et arrive dans les premiers jours d'août de l'année 1612. C'est là qu'il se met en rapport avec Robert Guérin qui avait abandonné Valleran le Conte en même temps que de Vautrel au printemps de 1611 ; rien ne nous renseigne sur l'activité de Robert entre ces deux dates. Les deux comédiens s'adressent aux Confrères et, le 4 août 1612, ils signent ensemble un bail qui leur donne le droit de donner des représentations pendant deux mois à l'Hôtel de Bourgogne.

Les portes de la grande salle de théâtre se rouvrent-elles grâce à

l'intervention du roi et le public se remet-il à fréquenter le théâtre? On pourrait le supposer mais la réalité est tout autre. A la reprise de la vie théâtrale à Paris un deuxième obstacle s'oppose: une querelle conjugale entre deux membres de la troupe de François de Vautrel. Celle-ci se composait outre le chef et les trois comédiens mentionnés plus haut, Estienne de Ruffin, Hugues Guéru et Loys Nicier, de Jehan Dumayne, Fleury Jacob et Colombe Venier, sa femme, la sœur de l'actrice plus connue, Marie Venier, épouse de Mathieu le Febvre, dit Laporte. Colombe et Marie étaient les filles de Jehan Venier et Perrette le Vasseur; leur père était procureur au bailliage de Sens; les jeunes filles étaient donc de très bonne famille. Ces données ignorées jusqu'à présent nous les empruntons à l'acte de mariage de Marie Venier <sup>4</sup> trouvé par nous; où et quand le mariage de Colombe et de Fleury Jacob a été contracté n'a pas encore été découvert. Des lettres de rémission du 14 septembre 1613, citées plus haut, il ressort que Colombe s'est faite comédienne sur l'instigation de son époux et que celui-ci a prêté tout son concours pour la préparer à cette profession. C'est ainsi qu'ils remplissent tous les deux des rôles dans les poèmes dramatiques que la troupe de François de Vautrel jouait à Toulouse en 1611. Que la bonne-entente entre les époux laissât beaucoup à désirer depuis longtemps, c'est un fait avéré, dans la seconde moitié de l'année 1611, il y eut en effet une franche rupture entre eux.

Les comédiens qui ont pris le parti de Colombe nous apprennent eux-mêmes la raison qui a donné naissance à ce conflit. Selon eux Fleury Jacob, subitement dégoûté de sa profession de comédien, aurait préféré être "homme libertin." Voilà pourquoi il aurait quitté la troupe et exigé de sa femme de suivre son exemple. Colombe aurait refusé d'obéir à cet ordre. Par suite de son désistement de la troupe Fleury était sans ressources et dans l'impossibilité de "nourir et entretenir" son épouse; celle-ci serait donc restée comédienne pour subvenir à ses besoins.

Mais—cette manière de présenter les choses de la part des comédiens ne peut être conforme à la réalité. Quelles objections Fleury qui n'était effectivement pas en état de fournir le nécessaire à Colombe aurait-il pu faire contre l'exercice de la profession de

<sup>4</sup> Ce document en même temps que d'autres sera publié sous peu, dans une étude consacrée à Mathieu le Febvre, dit Laporte, et à Marie Venier, sa femme.

comédienne par celle-ci, activité qui la préservait elle-même et peut-être aussi son mari du dénuement complet? La prévoyance de Colombe ne peut expliquer ni la colère violente de Jacob, lorsque sa femme persiste dans sa décision de rester fidèle à la troupe, ni le fait étrange que Fleury, dans ses accusations et son opposition, laisse sa femme hors d'atteinte, mais s'en prend uniquement aux acteurs. N'a-t-il pas recours au "Capitoul" de Toulouse<sup>5</sup> et n'accuse-t-il pas ses anciens camarades de retenir et d'empêcher Colombe de suivre son mari? Tout cela permet de supposer—hypothèse d'ailleurs motivée par la fin de l'histoire—que la querelle conjugale a une toute autre origine et que l'épouse Colombe déçue par le mariage a trouvé consolation en l'un de ses camarades à qui elle ne peut, ni ne veut renoncer. Voilà la raison véritable des emportements de la colère et des vagues de jalousie de Fleury!

Dans le jugement rendu par le Capitoul, Jacob a obtenu gain de cause. L'ordonnance du 28 novembre 1611 interdit aux comédiens de garder Colombe dans leur compagnie. Cependant pour éviter que Colombe Venier ne soit privée de ressources, Fleury est obligé de lui verser mensuellement une pension de 25 livres tournois. Se fondant sur cette même ordonnance Fleury fait saisir "les meubles et équipages" des cinq autres membres de la compagnie. Ceux-ci ne pourront reprendre possession des biens en question que le jour où Colombe aura rejoint son mari.

Toutefois l'époux exaspéré n'est pas en état de payer les sommes dues; c'est en vain que Colombe attend le versement de sa pension. Les comédiens mettant à profit l'omission du délinquant le poursuivent en justice. Dans une plainte déposée par eux au Capitoul, Jacob est accusé d'avoir laissé sans ressources sa femme qui a besoin de protection et d'argent pour vivre. C'est alors que les magistrats de Toulouse interviennent en ordonnant à la troupe d'acteurs de garder Colombe à leur service; les comédiens seront même condamnés à payer une amende de 500 livres tournois s'ils privent cette actrice des revenus provenant de son emploi.

Cette querelle conjugale a eu comme première conséquence le retard dans la reprise de la vie théâtrale à Paris. Lorsque Robert Guérin et François de Vautrel signent le bail de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne du 4 août 1612 à Paris, la troupe de Toulouse a déjà repris

<sup>5</sup> Nom donné au moyen âge et jusqu'à la Révolution aux magistrats municipaux de Toulouse.

le chariot de Thespis et peut être attendue sous peu dans la capitale; la salle de la rue Mauconseil n'étant pas occupée par d'autres locataires la nouvelle troupe pourra en prendre possession aussitôt; Paris désire ardemment voir des représentations théâtrales et c'est la volonté expresse du roi que celles-ci soient reprises au plus tôt. Etant donné ces faits tout délai ne paraît-il pas inutile et même impossible? Néanmoins cette période de deux mois de location pendant laquelle les comédiens occuperont la salle de la rue Mauconseil ne commencera que le premier novembre, c'est-à-dire presque trois mois après la date de conclusion du bail.

Ce délai exigé incontestablement par François de Vautrel s'explique d'ailleurs très bien. Fleury Jacob n'avait-il pas saisi les décors de la troupe et les costumes des acteurs et ne reste-t-il pas à savoir s'il veut les rendre à leurs propriétaires légitimes? En outre, il faut craindre une réaction violente de la part de l'époux jaloux au moment où celui-ci apprendra que sa compagne est partie avec les comédiens de Toulouse et l'a donc abandonné définitivement. François de Vautrel aura à tenir compte de toutes sortes de possibilités et ne pourra prendre sur lui l'engagement de venir jouer à Paris dans le plus bref délai. Il s'agit de gagner du temps pour régler les affaires et mener le différend à bonne fin. Et d'accord avec Robert Guérin les représentations théâtrales seront différées jusqu'à une date ultérieure.

Cependant cette querelle conjugale a entraîné une autre conséquence plus grave. Même à la date fixée les portes du théâtre de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne ne s'ouvrent pas. Robert Guérin est le seul comédien présent à Paris; la troupe de François de Vautrel se fait attendre. Qu'est-ce qui s'est passé?

Fleury Jacob en apprenant que sa femme Colombe et les acteurs étaient partis de Toulouse en toute hâte était hors de lui de rage. Il comprend aussitôt que le moment opportun se présente de nouveau pour lui. Il court au Parlement de Toulouse et accuse François de Vautrel, Hugues Guéru, Jehan Dumayne, Loys Nicyer et Estienne de Ruffin d'avoir enlevé sa femme.

Le Parlement prononce le 12 août le jugement suivant "par default et contumace"; les cinq comédiens sont bannis à perpétuité de tout le royaume de France, leurs biens seront confisqués et interdiction leur est faite de garder Colombe dans leur compagnie.

Cette condamnation émeut vivement nos comédiens. Que faire maintenant? Ils décident de prendre d'abord contact avec la partie

plaignante; lors d'une rencontre avec Jacob quelque part en France, ils exposent à celui-ci qu'ils n'avaient nullement eu l'intention d'enlever sa femme et qu'ils n'avaient pas quitté Toulouse de leur propre gré, mais que le départ de la troupe, Colombe y comprise, avait été ordonné par le roi, ordre auquel ils ne pouvaient s'opposer. Fleury se rendant à la raison finit par admettre l'explication donnée au départ précipité. Le 23 octobre 1612 il passe une "transaction" avec les comédiens "par laquelle il s'est désisté de l'effect de l'arrêt" du Parlement de Toulouse du 12 août 1612.

Cette paix signée avec l'accusateur n'annule cependant pas le jugement prononcé par le Parlement de Toulouse contre les comédiens. Tant que cet arrêt n'a pas été cassé le bannissement reste en vigueur et nos acteurs n'oseront plus exercer leur profession dans le royaume de France. C'est alors qu'ils font appel au roi Louis XIII, dans une "humble supplication," pour lui demander en exposant les faits de les acquitter de l'exil et de les rappeler. En attendant la décision que sa Majesté prendra en temps voulu, ils partent à l'étranger. Dans quel coin du monde les comédiens se rendent-ils? M. Lancaster a supposé que le voyage aux Pays-Bas de Valleran le Conte en 1612 et 1613 est intimement lié au bannissement des cinq comédiens<sup>6</sup> en question. Ceux-ci auraient donc fait partie de la troupe de Valleran. Cette hypothèse qui a été admissible du temps où nous ignorions tout des activités et des compagnies du grand acteur n'est plus soutenable. Les comédiens accompagnant Valleran vers les Pays-Bas nous sont, en effet, tous connus de nom. Parmi eux on ne compte pas François de Vautrel et ses membres; ceux-ci doivent donc avoir fait une tournée à eux seuls, dans des pays dont nous ignorons le nom jusqu'à présent.

De la sorte la querelle conjugale entre Fleury Jacob et Colombe Venier a été cause de la continuation de fermeture de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne en novembre et décembre 1612 malgré la signature du bail. Ceci ne va pas sans causer du préjudice aux Confrères de la Passion, aussi exigent-ils une indemnité. Au mois de mars de l'année 1613 Robert Guérin, François de Vautrel et leurs compagnons ont été condamnés par le Châtelet à payer 36 livres tournois aux Maîtres et Gouverneurs de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne.<sup>7</sup>

A cette situation intenable régnant à Paris aucune modification

<sup>6</sup> *A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century*, Part I, p. 732.

<sup>7</sup> Soulié, *Recherches sur Molière*, Paris 1863, p. 156.



n'a été apportée en 1613. Pendant que l'échec de Valleran le Comte ne donnait toujours pas la moindre envie à d'autres troupes ambulantes de tenter la fortune dans la capitale, et qu'aucun des anciens camarades de Valleran ne pensait à retourner à Paris où les ressources leur avaient toujours fait défaut, c'est la querelle conjugale qui force l'unique troupe disposée à donner des représentations dans la capitale à se mettre à l'abri dans des pays étrangers. L'hiver de 1612 à 1613, le printemps, l'été et l'automne de 1613, un nouvel hiver et un autre printemps s'écoulaient sans voir renaître le théâtre français à Paris.

Le 14 septembre 1613, Louis XIII accorde des lettres de rémission à cinq de ses comédiens, condamnés à l'exil par le Parlement de Toulouse. Le roi les "acquitte du bannissement, les rappelle auprès de lui où ils sont d'habitude et leurs biens leur seront rendus." Maintenant François de Vautrel et les siens pouvaient donc revenir en France et à plus forte raison dans la capitale.

Quelques semaines plus tard, après une fermeture de plus d'une année et demie, la réouverture de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne a lieu. Toutefois ce ne sont pas nos comédiens français qui y commencent une série de représentations, c'est pour la compagnie italienne, sous la direction de Tristano Martinelli, dit Arlequin, tant demandée par la cour que la reine a loué la salle de la rue Mauconseil pour une période de six mois, qui commence au premier octobre pour se terminer le 31 mars 1614. Le 8 avril Martinelli signe encore un nouveau bail de deux mois dont la durée est prolongée le 9 juin<sup>8</sup>. Les comédiens italiens ont donc mis à profit cette longue absence des acteurs français et l'arrêt dans la vie théâtrale de la capitale.

Finalement les exilés reviennent de l'étranger. C'est parce qu'ils avaient à réclamer d'abord à Toulouse la remise des biens confisqués que leur voyage a sans doute duré si longtemps. Le 27 juin 1614, le noble homme Mathieu de Roger, sieur de Champluisant, loue la grande salle de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne, à partir de cette date jusqu'au 30 septembre 1614, au nom de la troupe de François de Vautrel. Si la manière dont les Confrères se sont arrangés avec eux reflète l'accueil qui leur a été fait par la capitale, alors nous pouvons constater que ce fut un retour joyeux. Les Maîtres et Gouverneurs témoignent de la bienveillance à leur égard, ils leur accordent une diminution de loyer, celui-ci s'étant toujours élevé à au moins 200

<sup>8</sup> *Documents inédits.*

livres tournois par mois, sera de 160 livres tournois pour eux. Et lorsque la troupe, qui pour des raisons inconnues ne peut être présente à Paris à la date convenue, ne commence ses représentations que douze jours plus tard les Confrères lui octroient une réduction de 60 livres tournois sur le loyer.

Dans la seconde semaine du mois de juillet 1614, c'est-à-dire près de deux années et demie après le départ de Valleran le Conte, les comédiens du roi se trouvent de nouveau pour la première fois sur la scène de la grande salle de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne. La vie théâtrale de Paris, le théâtre français renaît!

Il ressort du bail signé le 28 novembre 1615, par les comédiens du roi, que Colombe Venier a convolé en secondes noces avec l'un des anciens bannis, Estienne de Ruffin, sieur de la Fontaine.<sup>9</sup>

S. WILMA DEIERKAUF-HOLSBOER

Viroflay, Seine-et-Oise

## KEATS' ELYSIUM OF POETS

Evidently speaking from his own experience as a poet, Stephen Spender claims that poetry "sometimes appears to spring independently from books. . . . Yet I do not believe there is any poetry which does not spring from intense literary experiences as much as from what is called life."<sup>1</sup> These remarks, because they emphasize the importance of learning from books in poetic development, should be applied to the Romantic poets; for in popular imagination, and often in scholarly criticism, it is assumed they drew their inspiration, substance, and images exclusively from their immediate experience of life and the one impulse from a vernal wood. But as a matter of fact a fair body of their poetry derives directly from books, and from what Mr. Spender does not mention as part of the education of the poet, the contemplation of monuments and objects of art.<sup>2</sup> In Keats alone the verses on Chapman's Homer, *King Lear*, *The Story of Rimini*, *The Flower and the Leaf*, the

<sup>9</sup> *Doc. inéd.*

<sup>1</sup> *Life and the Poet* (London, 1942), p. 118.

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, Coleridge's "The Garden of Boccaccio," Shelley's "On the Medusa of Leonardo da Vinci," Rossetti's *Sonnets for Pictures* and "The Burden of Nineveh," passages in *Ohilde Harold*, IV, and Peacock's satire (*Nightmare Abbey*, ch. XI) on Byron's interest in one-legged Venuses

Elgin Marbles, a Gem of Leander, and a Grecian Urn are excellent examples of art-poetry, a genre which until recently was not given the attention it deserves.<sup>3</sup> More than any other Romantic poet, Keats found his inspiration and themes in myths, literary works and objects of art, and so utilized his source as to make it an important element in the context of meaning.

How important a knowledge of source material is in a fruitful reading of poetry of this kind is best illustrated from Keats' "On First Looking into Chapman's Homer," and particularly from the octave, which has been generally taken as a metaphorical rendering of actual nature, when in point of fact the phrase "western islands" indicates that the poet is using allusively an artistic and mythical topography as old as Homer. On the assumption that Keats used Robertson's *History of America* for the octave as well as the sestet, J. W. Beach argues that these islands are the West Indies.<sup>4</sup> But the West Indies are not realms of gold, and they do not so appear in Robertson, to whom they are savage places, some of them inhabited by cannibals.<sup>5</sup> It can be shown that the western islands are an oblique allusion to the Islands of the Blest, and that Keats, inspired by a mythical topography, built his own myth of the

and headless Minervas. Wordsworth, who might be least suspected of attempting this kind of verse, often turned with some relief, as he tells us ("Pillar of Trajan," 23-34), from nature to the contemplation of works of art. See, for example, his verses on the Cathedral of Cologne, Leonardo da Vinci's Last Supper, Raphael's the Baptist, the Campo Santo of Pisa, etc., in *Memorials of a Tour of the Continent* and *Memorials of a Tour of Italy*; poems on painters and paintings (and books) in *Miscellaneous Sonnets*, "Elegiac Stanzas" on Beaumont's Peele Castle, the effusions on pictures of the Bird of Paradise, Lucca Giordano's Endymion, and especially "Lines Suggested by a Portrait from the Pencil of F. Stone," in which Wordsworth elaborates on the glory of art, a favorite theme in his later verse.

<sup>3</sup> Edmund Blunden, "Romantic Poetry and the Fine Arts," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, xxviii (London, 1942), Stephen A. Larrabee, *English Bards and Grecian Marbles* (New York, 1943). Keats' interest in art-poetry was apparently intense; according to Woodhouse (C. L. Finney, *The Evolution of Keats's Poetry*, Cambridge, Mass., 1936, I, 192), he planned a series of sonnets on James Tassie's descriptions of ancient and modern gems and cameos.

<sup>4</sup> "Keats's Realms of Gold," *PMLA*, xlix (1934), 248. Cf. Finney (I, 123) who agrees with Professor Beach, but adds that another source is "the mythological story of the Elysium of poets" which Keats read in English poetry. See n. 21 and 22 below.

<sup>5</sup> *The Works of William Robertson* (London, 1821), vii, 114; viii, 107.

Elysium of poets living in a beautiful west about which, says Strabo, poets after Homer keep "dinning stories into our ears."<sup>6</sup> It is in the sestet that the poet returns to the actual world. In the octave, meanwhile, Keats is another poet after Homer (and after Drayton), dinning another story about the west into our ears.

The important inner meaning of the narrative in the octave is the apotheosis of poetry and poets. Poetry is equated with golden regions vaguely westward, and poets with kings ruling over them.<sup>7</sup> The closely knit metaphorical language outlines an ideal polity, well organized as from higher to lower, with poet kings holding their domains in fief and owing allegiance to Apollo as lord, and Homer as master of the epic is appropriately described as ruler of the largest of the island kingdoms.<sup>8</sup> The point to be noted is that this allegorical journey westward alludes to the immortality of older poets, who live not only in the poetry they left behind, but also in another world, fair and wonderful, where they still enjoy Apollo's favor. Poets have a "double immortality," as Keats calls it in his comments on the ode "Bards of Passion and of Mirth,"<sup>9</sup> which makes explicit what is allusive in the sonnet.

Bards of Passion and of Mirth,  
Ye have left your souls on earth!  
Ye have souls in heaven too,  
Double-lived in regions new!

The Elysium Keats constructs, and symbolizes by the golden world of poetry the poets left behind, conforms closely to a "favorite

<sup>6</sup> *Geography*, III 2. 13, trans Horace Leonard Jones, Loeb Class Library.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Sleep and Poetry*, 267-268, and *Hyperion*, II, 228-229, on poet kings.

<sup>8</sup> At lines 5-6 the sonnet re-phrases a notion found in an earlier poem, the epistle "To Charles Cowden Clarke," 66-67: Clarke had taught Keats that "epic was of all the king, / Round, vast, and spanning all like Saturn's ring." That Keats implies a value in the topographical references to poetry in the Chapman sonnet and elsewhere, is clear from his elaborate metaphor contrasting, in his attack on Wordsworth, modern poets as governors of petty states and older poets as "Emperors of vast Provinces" (*The Letters of John Keats*, ed. M. B. Forman, 2nd ed., London, 1935, p. 96); Keats underscores his attack by including in the letter "Lines on the Mermaid Tavern," which eulogizes and places the older poets in Elysium. Cf. the "dominions" of Milton ("Lines on Seeing a Lock of Milton's Hair"); "that greatest mastery / And kingdom over all the Realms of verse" ("Acrostic"), and the partial defense of *Endymion* as a "little region" (*Letters*, p. 53).

<sup>9</sup> *Letters*, p. 265. For a possible source of this idea see Spenser's *The Ruines of Time*, 310-343.

Speculation" of his, "that we shall enjoy ourselves here after by having what we called happiness on Earth repeated in a finer tone and so repeated."<sup>10</sup> In the "Ode to Apollo," which anticipates the mythopoeic quality of the sonnet, the souls of poets in the god's "western halls of gold" still enjoy a mastership of the art of song; and in "Lines to the Mermaid Tavern" they sip divine beverage in an Elysian tavern. Similarly, in the octave of the Chapman sonnet the poets follow their old pursuit in an ideal commonwealth where, still inspired by Apollo, their happiness consists in a continued mastery of their art. As is fitting in such a context, Homer is neither old nor blind, he resembles the youthful and vigorous Homer of Keats' other early verse.<sup>11</sup>

That an Elysium is involved becomes apparent when the phrase "western islands" is examined in the light of Keats' certain and probable reading in ancient and modern literature dealing with an idealized and mythical topography which features those fortunate islands where dwell the manes of heroes. Valuable as the passages in Robertson's history are in illuminating this journey westward, they are less valuable than passages from mythographers. Moreover, commentators have overlooked references in Robertson to the Fortunate Islands (the Canaries),<sup>12</sup> which to a poet as deeply affected as Keats was by classical myth would suggest the Elysium dreamed by the ancients, who associated with any Atlantic islands, actual or conjectural, a utopian existence after death and the survival of the Golden Age of Saturn's reign.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>10</sup> *Letters*, 68.

<sup>11</sup> "Ode to Apollo," s. 2; "I Stood Tip-Toe," 217. Homer "looks out through renovated eyes" and steps "at the trumpet's call"—an unorthodox portrait which has puzzled readers. The best explanation is found in an article by H. E. Briggs ("Swift and Keats," *PMLA*, lxi, December 1946, 1104), who points out that Keats' portrait may be traced to the description of Homer in *Gulliver's Travels*, iii, viii: Homer "walked very erect for one of his age," says Swift, "and his eyes were the most quick and piercing I ever beheld." Cf. the martial Homer leading the horse in *The Battle of the Books*.

<sup>12</sup> *Op cit.*, vii, 10, 42, 374.

<sup>13</sup> Actual islands off the African coast, says Plutarch ("Sertorius," viii, *Lives*), were universally thought to be, even among barbarians, the location of the Elysian Field and the home of blessed spirits. Cf. Strabo, i. 1 5. So persistent was this belief that Lucian, in *A True History*, elaborately burlesques it in his description of wonderful western islands. Elizabethan writers sometimes identified England with one of the Fortunate Islands (R. Cawley, *Unpathed Waters*, Princeton, 1940, pp 12-13). This identifica-

At the Enfield school Keats read not only Robertson, but also John Lemprière's dictionary which, so Clarke emphasizes, "he appeared to learn."<sup>14</sup> The dictionary summarizes the legends about fruitful and idyllic islands west of Mauritania,<sup>15</sup> "represented as the seats of the blessed," with a "wholesome and temperate" air which might have suggested to Keats the "pure serene" of Homer's kingdom. In identifying Elysium with western islands, Lemprière followed closely some of the classical writers he refers to as sources of information. Two of them (Horace, *Epode* xvi, and Plutarch, "Life of Sertorius"), and two other sources (*Odyssey*, iv, 563-568, and *Aeneid*, vi, 637 ff.) not mentioned but paraphrased by Lemprière, may have been known to Keats before the composition of the sonnet in October of 1816. He was probably reading Horace some time before the fall of 1816, for Keats quotes him in the earliest known letter.<sup>16</sup> According to Clarke,<sup>17</sup> Keats read Homer in Pope's version at Enfield, and finished translating the *Aeneid* shortly after he left school. Plutarch's account of Sertorius' yearning to visit the Fortunate Islands is reported in Lemprière; but the *Lives* may have been known directly to Keats through Tom,<sup>18</sup> who in the spring of 1817 was reading to his brother passages from Pope's Homer found in a translation of

tion may derive from the ancient legends of the Elysium of the Hyperboreans, who were particularly favored by Apollo (see A. O. Lovejoy and George Boas, *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*, Baltimore, 1935, p. 304 ff, and especially p. 307). Keats, it should be noted, makes England Apollo's land (*Sleep and Poetry*, 171-183). Cf. Dayton, *Poly-Olbion*, Illustration to "The Eighth Song," 100 "Apollo . . . is showed to have been expressly among the Britons."

<sup>14</sup> *Recollections of Writers* (New York, [1878]), p. 124.

<sup>15</sup> *A Classical Dictionary*, 7th ed. (London, 1809), under "Fortunatae Insulae" and "Elysium."

<sup>16</sup> *Letters*, p. 4. There is disagreement on the dating of this letter, written from Dean Street and dated simply "Wednesday Octr 9th," which fell in 1816. Since there is no evidence that Keats lived in Dean Street in 1816, M. B. Forman claims Wednesday, October 11, 1815, as the correct date, W. H. Garrod, Wednesday, October 9, 1816 (*The Poetical Works of John Keats*, Oxford, 1939, p. lxxii). Garrod's dating is preferable; for the letter mentions verses "composed some time ago," among them the epistle "To George Felton Mathew," dated November 1815. Garrod argues that the letter preceded Keats and Clarke's reading in Chapman's Homer, a conclusion reasonably warranted by internal evidence.

<sup>17</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 125, 129.

<sup>18</sup> *Letters*, p. 29.

Plutarch, which can be identified as that of John and William Langhorne since it carries, interestingly enough, Pope's version of Homer's description of the Islands of the Blest.<sup>19</sup> Virgil locates Elysium underground; but all other writers, with the possible exception of Tibullus, agree on its remoteness in a western ocean,<sup>20</sup> a distinctive feature of Keats' description. The original of Keats' Elysium of poets is in the *Aeneid* (VI, 660 ff.), where Virgil departs from the tradition of reserving Elysium solely for warrior folk and demi-gods and introduces *pu vates* whose songs were worthy of Phoebus and who, as in Keats' "Ode to Apollo" and the Chapman sonnet, ideally pursue the art of poetry. In this Virgil was followed by English poets,<sup>21</sup> particularly Drayton, who eloquently describes Apollo's prophets enjoying immortality "Among the flowres that never fade, / But flowrish like their wit."

The Poets Paradise this is,  
To which but few can come;  
The Muses onely bower of blisse  
Their Deare *Elysium*.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup> *Plutarch's Lives*, trans. John and William Langhorne, 6 vols. (London, 1770), I, 233; cf. IV, 10-11. There was a second edition in 1813.

<sup>20</sup> Lovejoy and Boas, pp. 290 ff., 30. A passage in Tibullus, I III 57-66, not cited by Lovejoy and Boas, describes a Virgilian Elysium, but the reference to the untilled earth bearing fruit suggests the Islands of the Blest. Such commingling is not unusual among the ancients, the best instance of it is found in Horace's *Epode* XVI, which combines Elysium, the Islands of the Blest, and the Fortunate Islands.

<sup>21</sup> Spenser, *loc. cit.*; Chapman, sonnet to the Earl of Southampton (*The Poems*, ed. Phyllis Brooks Bartlett, New York, 1941, p. 401; cf. Chapman's translation of Silus Italicus' praise of Homer, p. 390), Milton, ending to "L'Allegro," quoted by Keats in the epistle "To George Felton Mathew," 18, which antedates the Chapman sonnet, Vansittart, "The Pleasure of Poetry" (Dodsley's *A Collection of Poems*, London, 1763, III, 226), discussed by Finney (I, 63) as a likely model for Keats' "Ode to Apollo" (cf. other descriptions of the Elysium of poets in Dodsley, II, 75, 107-109, and VI, 17).

<sup>22</sup> "The Description of Elysium," initial song of *The Muses Elysium*; cf. "To My Worthy Friend Mr. George Chapman" (*The Works of Michael Drayton*, ed. J. William Hebel, Oxford, 1931, I, 503).

In blest *Elysium* (in a place most fit)  
Under the tree due to the Delphian God,  
*Musaeus*, and that *Ilhad Singer* sit,  
And neare to them that noble *Hesiod*.

Keats' innovation consists in compounding the Virgilian and English Elysium with famed western islands, which serve two functions in the sonnet. They are the immortality of poets, and they symbolize the excellence of their poetry. Keats is so impressed by the greatness of poets and their poetry that he appropriately refers us to a supernature traditionally identified with remote western regions, better ordered and more splendid than the actual. The metaphors are not drawn from nature; "the realms of gold" and the "wide expanse" with its "pure serene" suggest an artistic and imaginative topography of a supernature set apart by the ancients beyond the bounds of the known world, and copied by English poets who frequently transferred to the New World features of the ancient islands.<sup>23</sup> The "wide expanse" and "pure serene," Professor Beach contends, allude to the Pacific, ruled by Homer, and so by extension the epic poet rules vast lands, for who controls the seas controls the lands they touch, this, it is argued, Keats learned from Robertson. But aside from the question of the fitness of an expanse of ocean in the context of "demesne," to understand Homer as ruling the Pacific is to make the last four lines, where we meet Cortez staring at the Pacific, anti-climactic and somewhat redundant. The sonnet progresses, not from Pacific to Pacific, but from mythical kingdoms vaguely located westward to the actual and localized—a planet and an ocean, the discovery of which makes explicit the sense of admiration mixed with awe before the greatness of Homer (and the unnamed poets) in the octave, an admiration translated into an allusion to a western Elysium which is the poet's reward. The allusion to a myth carries out the archaic flavor of a language ("bards in fealty to Apollo") referring us to past literature and a poet-mythographer, and underlines the quality of remoteness appropriate to a description of an ideal world far removed from the actual.

G. GIOVANNINI

*The Catholic University of America*

---

<sup>23</sup> See Drayton, "To the Virginian Voyage"; Waller, *Battle of the Summer Islands*; Marvell, "Bermudas"; Joseph Warton, ending to "The Enthusiast"; Berkeley, "Verses on Planting Arts and Learning in America", and cf. Cawley, *op. cit.*, pp 26-30, on the West as the seat of the Earthly Paradise. The classical features of western islands and lands are preserved by Milton, read by Keats at the Enfield school, in the Spirit's epilogue in *Comus*, and in *Paradise Lost*, III, 567-571, which combines the Fortunate Islands, the Elysian Fields, and the Garden of the Hesperides.



NEW MANUSCRIPTS OF *THE DICTS AND SAYINGS OF THE PHILOSOPHERS*

In my edition of *The Dicts and Sayings of the Philosophers*,<sup>1</sup> I listed all the English manuscripts of the various translations then known to me, to the number of thirteen.<sup>2</sup> Since two further manuscripts have come to my attention in the intervening years, it seems desirable to publish a short account of them. Both manuscripts contain the translation made by Earl Rivers and printed by William Caxton (Westminster, 1477),<sup>3</sup> and both have obviously been copied from the printed volumes.

I. Columbia University Library, Plimpton Collection, MS. 259,<sup>4</sup> numbered folios 79-86v. Late fifteenth century; the title reads "Dyteys Philosophorum."<sup>5</sup>

The text is much condensed, being considerably shorter than in Caxton's print.<sup>6</sup> Though the quotations are frequently somewhat rewritten and equally often assigned to other philosophers

<sup>1</sup> E. E. T. S., O. S. 211 (1941), p. xix ff.

<sup>2</sup> To the list of French MSS noted on pp. xiii-xv can be added 42. Boston Public Library (see *More Books*, Sept. 1941, pp. 315-321, this may be my no. 41); 43. Paris, private collection, 1906 (cf. A. Boinet, "Un Bibliophile du XV<sup>e</sup> Siècle. Le grand Bâtard de Bourgogne," *Bibl de l'Ecole des Chartes*, LXVII, 1906, p. 261 ff.); 44. Major J. H. S. Borthwick sale, Sotheby, 3 June 1946, lot 198 (Quaritch, cat. 641, no. 847). In addition to the MSS. in the Bibliothèque Royale at Brussels which I noted on p. xiv, n. 2, Mr. H. Bober kindly informs me of two more in that library, MSS. 11109 and 11114.

<sup>3</sup> A facsimile edition was printed by William Blades, London, 1877.

<sup>4</sup> Seymour de Ricci, *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada*, New York, 1935-40, II, 1800, enters this under the Latin title "Dicta philosophorum" without noting that the text is in English. See also Samuel A. Ives, "Corrigenda and Addenda to the Descriptions of the Plimpton Manuscripts as recorded in the *De Ricci Census*," *Speculum*, XVII, p. 45. I have used the pencilled leaf notations in the MS., not Mr. Ives' numbers.

<sup>5</sup> The philosophers represented in the text appear in the following order. Hermes, Sabyon, Ypocras, Pythagoras, Dyogenes, Socrates, Platon, Alyzaundyr, Ptholome, Legmon, Assaron, Anes, Pthesylim, Galeon and Protege.

<sup>6</sup> It is scarcely probable that the MS. was copied from a manuscript text of Rivers' version rather than from the printed text, as subsequent footnotes will show.

than those to whom they are ascribed in the original,<sup>7</sup> there can be no doubt that they derive from the translation made by Earl Rivers. In the Plimpton MS., the chapter on Sabyon reads:

Sabyon seyð cut thy tung rathyr than spek any thyng that schold noy thy frendys And yef ye lese any thyng sey nat ye haue loste yt but restoryd that was nat yours

In the Caxton edition,<sup>8</sup> the same passage occurs as:

And in dede beyng in the engyne cut his tong with his owne teth / to thentent that he myght not accuse his felowes and frendes And the sayd sabyon lyued xlvij yere / and her after folowed of his seynges to his disciples And sayd if ye lese eny thing say not ye haue lost it but saye ye haue restored that was not youre<sup>9</sup>

Again the passage on Anese<sup>10</sup> in the Plimpton MS. reads:

Anes the Phylosophyr seyth whan men wax olde Theyre<sup>11</sup> vertuys be dyspysyd And he seyð the 1ych men be more fferfull then the pore. He seyð the nobyll deth ys better than the vyle dominacion One of the gretest vylonyes & inquiteys of the worlde ys for to do vyleny vn-to jupotent persones And he seyð the moste curteyse geuer ys he that geuet[h] on-axyd And seyð A<sup>12</sup> suspetchous man may neuer haue goode lyue<sup>13</sup> And seyð haue thy-selfe in goode A-weyte thow thou be strengier than thyn Enemy & en-dever the to make pease He that demaundet~~h~~ but reason ys abyll to vanquesche all his Ennemyys And he seyð yt ys A foule thyng to be so curius for the fedyng of the body to hurte both yt & the soule.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Guillaume Telin made a similar *florilegium* from the French text, see my edition, pp xvii-xviii.

<sup>8</sup> The quotations are taken from the two copies of Caxton's first edition in The Pierpont Morgan Library; cf Ada Thurston and Curt F Buhler, *Check List of Fifteenth Century Printing in The Pierpont Morgan Library*, New York, 1939, p. 166, nos. 1759 and 1759a. The two copies agree throughout in these quotations.

<sup>9</sup> Scrope (p 42, ll. 14-15) has: "if ye lese eny thinge, say not þat ye haue lost it, bot saithe þat ye hath restored þat þe whiche was not yours." The anonymous version reads "yf ye leese any thinge, loke ye seye nat that ye haue loste it but seye that ye haue made restitution of that that was nat yours."

<sup>10</sup> The other English translations as well as the French MSS. have Onese.

<sup>11</sup> Note that capital T (or A) is also found in the printed text.

<sup>12</sup> This sentence is omitted by the anonymous translator

<sup>13</sup> Scrope (252 26-28) renders this as: "& he saithe. it is a foule thing for vs to be besy in meetis for þe body without that we be besye in meetis for þe soule" The anonymous version (253. 29-31) has: "And seith: it is an euel thinge for vs to be desyerous of goode meetes for the body and leue the coryous meetes that shulde reffreshe the soule."

According to the other versions, only the first four sentences belong to Anese (Onese), the next four to Sacdarge (Magdarge) and the last one to Thesille. The comparable lines, in the order in which they occur in the Caxton edition, are.

Anese the phylosophre saith Whan men wexe olde Their vertues ben dyspysed And the riche men ben more ferful than poure men And he sayd the noble deth is better than a vyle domynacion . . . One of the grettest vylonyes & inyquitees of the world is for to do vilonie vnto an impotent persone . . . And he sayde the most curteys gyuer is he. that gyueth without axing And sayd In what someuer place thou be with thyn ennemy. be it in disporte or otherwyse make al way good wacche on thy self though so be thou be stronger than he and mightier yet laboure al way to make peas . . . And sayde. A suspicious man may neuer haue good lyf. . . . And sayde He that demaundeth but reason is able to vaynquyshe & ouercome his ennemye. . . . And sayde It is a foule thing to be so curious for the feding of the body that it hurteth both it & the saule.

As the footnotes have clearly indicated, the text of the Plumpton MS. was not derived from either the Scrope or the anonymous version. The choice of names, words and capitals proves that the text was copied from Caxton, though it cannot be determined with absolute certainty which particular edition<sup>14</sup> was used.

II. Curt F. Buhler, New York, MS. 11. 74 paper folios, the first two of which are unnumbered and 3-74 are foliated 1-72 with errors. Early seventeenth century.

The present manuscript is a copy of the edition usually described as Caxton's second edition (Blades 28, Duff 124),<sup>15</sup> as the follow-

<sup>14</sup> The early editions are listed by the *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland . . . 1475-1640* (STC), London 1926, nos. 6826-6830. Full bibliographical details for the fifteenth-century editions will be found in William Blades, *The Life and Typography of William Caxton*, London, 1861-63, nos. 10, 28 and 83, and E. Gordon Duff, *Fifteenth-century English Books*, Bibliographical Society, 1917, nos 123-125. The orthography indicates that the scribe may have used the second edition (Duff 124).

<sup>15</sup> In two papers I published in *The Library* (xv, 316-329 and xxi, 284-90), I attempted to show that this second edition was actually the first. Some evidence which came to my notice in May, 1942, seemed to indicate that my conclusions were incorrect. I have planned to investigate this problem more thoroughly when it is once again possible to consult all the copies of Caxton's edition now extant and the MSS at Lambeth are once more available for study.

ing two extracts will show. Under Pitagoras, the manuscript reads:

And said god is not only worshipped by the sacryfices or by other oblacions don vnto him but by the wille and acceptable ententis

In Caxton's second edition,<sup>16</sup> this sentence similarly appears as:

And said god is not onely worshipped by the sacrifices or by other oblacions don vnto hym but by the wyll and acceptable ententis

while the first edition prints:

And said god is not worshipped by the sacrifices or by other oblacious (sic) don vnto hym but onely by the wyll and acceptable ententis

Again the first line of Sacdarge reads in the manuscript:

Sacdarge saith that the werkis of this vnto another worlde ben guided by two thingis one is by science of *which* the soule is adressid & that other is bysenes of *which* the soule & the body ben entreteigned & knyght

While the second edition printed by Caxton agrees with the wording of the manuscript, the first edition presents:

Sacdarge saith that the werkes of this worlde ben adressid by two thingis one is by science of *whiche* the soule is adressyd, & that other is bysenes of *whiche* the soule & the body ben adressid

In every instance throughout the book, wherever the first and second editions differ, the manuscript has the text of the second edition.

At the end of the manuscript is found the note:

Wrytten oute for mee by my man John May in May 1621 19th Jacobi  
Regis Pe. Manwood

The signature is most probably that of Sir Peter Manwood, the learned antiquarian<sup>17</sup> and patron of learned men.<sup>18</sup> Curiously

<sup>16</sup> The quotation is taken from the copy in the Henry E. Huntington Library (Herman R. Mead, *Incunabula in the Huntington Library*, San Marino, 1937, no. 5226)

<sup>17</sup> In 1604 Manwood purchased a copy of Harding's *Chronicle* (now MS Ashmole 34 in the Bodleian), this being another example of his interest in antiquarian studies.

<sup>18</sup> Sir Peter was one of those interested in the founding of a Society of Antiquaries through application for a Royal charter in March, 1617/8 (cf. *Archaeologia*, I, xxi).

enough this manuscript was written only three months before Manwood was obliged to flee from England as the result of the financial difficulties into which his lavish style of living had brought him.<sup>19</sup>

It may be recalled that Sir Peter's son, Thomas Manwood, was drowned in France in 1613. William Browne<sup>20</sup> commemorated this premature death by an elegy which forms the fourth eclogue of his "The Shepherd's Pipe." This work is sometimes presumed to have suggested *Lycidas* or, at least, to have supplied some hints to Milton for that great elegy.<sup>21</sup> However this may be, the present manuscript provides conclusive evidence for the fact that a scholarly interest in mediaeval English texts survived into the age of Milton.

CURT F. BUHLER

*The Pierpont Morgan Library*

## TWO NOTES ON THE CHESS TERMS IN *THE BOOK OF THE DUCHESS*

The usual explanations of the role of the fers in *The Book of the Duchess* are not very enlightening. It is clear that Chaucer chose the fers to symbolize the wife of the mourning figure in black because the piece had feminine associations, being otherwise called the queen; but it is not so clear why he should have represented the loss of the fers as tantamount to losing the game. The details of the chess game—saying check, mate in the middle of the board by a 'poun errant,' fortune as an opponent, the loss of the fers—are all taken from *The Roman de la Rose*, as Skeat has shown.<sup>1</sup> Chaucer probably uses *fers* because the *Roman* uses the word; see *fierce*, l.

<sup>19</sup> See *DNB*, xxxvi, 106

<sup>20</sup> Browne was himself an antiquarian who drew upon the works of Hoccleve; compare W. C. Hazlitt's edition of Browne's *Works*, London, 1868-9, I, xxi, and E. P. Hammond, *English Verse between Chaucer and Surrey*, Durham (N. C.), 1927, pp. 56, 58-9

<sup>21</sup> Hazlitt, *op cit*, I, xxv, and Hugh C. H. Candy, "Milton's Reading of Browne," *Notes and Queries*, CLVIII, 310-12.

<sup>1</sup> *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. Rev. Walter W. Skeat (Oxford, 1899), I, 478.

6711 in the text of Langlois, where its loss also causes the loss of the game.

In modern chess, where the queen is by far the most powerful piece, her loss could easily be fatal. But in medieval chess the queen was not nearly so powerful and hence the parallel that Skeat chooses is not to the point.<sup>2</sup> Beryn may have been 'in hevye plyghte' when he lost his rook, for the rook was the strongest piece in the medieval game.<sup>3</sup> Recognizing the fact that the medieval queen did not have much power, as she was limited to a move to "an adjacent diagonal square,"<sup>4</sup> Robinson suggests that "Chaucer may have had in mind the power of a real queen."<sup>5</sup> However, this is also beside the point. The role the fers played in medieval chess strategy, not her importance as an aggressive piece, explains why the *Roman* and Chaucer could represent her loss as being tantamount to the loss of the game. The usual strategy of the queen is thus expressed by Murray. "The main use that he [the medieval player] made of his Queen was to keep her in close attendance on the King to interpose her when the opponent's Rook checked from the other side of the board."<sup>6</sup> The "close attendance" of the two may have suggested the relation of husband and wife, which they symbolize in *The Book of the Duchess*. Also, the medieval game must frequently have ended with the loss of the queen, since the king thereafter would have no protection from the attack of the powerful rook, especially in the ending called "the Bare King," in which the king of the loser has been deprived of all his protection.<sup>7</sup> Since the queen had little aggressive power, there would be no reason for a player to entrap her as early as possible, as there is in the modern game. Assuming that, then as now, most players were opportunistic, a player would probably let her go to the end and concentrate on the more powerful figures. Even if she had been lost earlier, as in the passage from *The Roman de la Rose*, her loss would be felt most keenly at the end when the rook checked from the side.

Several quotations from sources given in full by Murray will

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 480

<sup>3</sup> H. J. R. Murray, *A History of Chess* (Oxford, 1913), p. 470

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 452.

<sup>5</sup> *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. N. Robinson (Cambridge, Mass., 1933), p. 884.

<sup>6</sup> *Op cit.*, p. 470.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 452.

illustrate the role of the queen. A poem published by Thomas Hyde in his *Mandragoras* (1698) under the title *De Shahludio*, has the following lines (25-27) on the move and function of the queen:

Nam regina non ualebit Impedire alteram  
Sui regi deputata Velut pro custodia  
Circumquaque per transuersum Binas regat tabulas.<sup>8</sup>

Another quotation will show that the loss of the queen was frequently the prelude to the loss of the game. It is taken from a poem entitled *Elegia de Ludo Scachorum* (ll. 33-34):

Rex manet incaptus, subtracta coniuge solus.  
Coniuge subtracta, nil ualet in tabula.

According to other readings, the second half of the last line should be "nil manet in tabula," or "rex manet in tabula."<sup>9</sup> The poem goes on to show that after the queen is gone only mate remains to the king. Of this poem Murray says that it attaches "extraordinary importance" to the queen, so much so as to raise "doubts as to the accuracy of the text."<sup>10</sup> But surely, if the queen acted as a guard, she would be the last piece to be taken, and Murray has indicated that such was the usual strategy.

It seems pretty clear to me that what Chaucer had in mind was the close association of the king and fers, suggesting the close relation of lover and beloved, husband and wife (this in addition to the other name of the piece), and the fact that from that "close attendance" the fers was likely to be the last piece taken before the king was mated, certainly the situation in *The Book of the Duchess*.

II. Another puzzle in the use of the word *fers* has been created by the explanations of lines 722-725:

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 515. Murray explains that *binas* is loosely used, and that the line means that the queen may move to an *adjacent* square (p. 500). The poem, he thinks, is of the twelfth century (p. 499).

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 516. The poem exists in seven MSS dating from the twelfth to the sixteenth century, one at Oxford (p. 503).

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 504. For further evidence of the station of the fers (or Vizir) near the king to guard over him, see Antonius van der Linde, *Quellenstudien zur Geschichte des Schachspiels* (Berlin, 1881), pp. 30 and 33, a French and German translation of an Arabic codex, and pp. 78 and 86 for a Spanish codex, *Libro del Acedrex*, and German translation.

Ne say noght soo, for trewely,  
 Thogh ye had lost the feises twelve,  
 And ye for sorwe mordred yourselve,  
 Ye sholde be dampned. . .

The man in black has been explaining that he has lost his fers and thereby the game; the dreamer warns him that had his loss been twelve times as great as he says it is, and great enough to cause suicide, he would have been damned for the suicide as were the classical persons he mentions. Of course, the dreamer does not yet recognize the symbolism.

Assuming that *fers* may have meant piece in general as well as a particular piece, in itself an unlikely assumption, the trouble in the accepted explanation lies in the word *twelve*. Skeat understood the reference to be to a single game ending with the Bare King.<sup>11</sup> He had difficulty with the numbers. Bell understood all the pieces except the pawns, but that gave only seven: Skeat counted the eight pawns but could not count the seven pieces since that would give fifteen. He therefore counted *all* the pawns and *one* rook, *one* knight, *one* bishop, and the queen and got twelve. In counting the major pieces, he counted *kinds*, but in counting the pawns, he counted each one. "Each pawn," he says, "had an individuality of its own." He cites Caxton's *Game of Chess* to show that each pawn represented an occupation, such as laborer, smith, physician, etc. Robinson accepted the explanation and added a reference from Murray to the Bare King ending.<sup>12</sup> But in a Bare King ending, the winning player must have taken exactly fifteen pieces. However neat the allegory, it does not fit the conditions of the actual game, as it must if it is to be of any use as an explanation. Actually, the dreamer is probably not thinking of any single game. The game has been lost, no matter how, and the man in black laments in particular his fers. For the dreamer to come back and say, "Even though you had lost the game by losing all the pieces," would have been almost nonsense. The man in black has lost all his pieces in losing the game, even though it is the loss of one piece that he chooses to mourn. The method of losing does not matter here. Surely the dreamer means, not "Had you lost the game in a different way," but "Had your loss been twelve times as great," i.e.,

<sup>11</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 481-2. He took his cue from Bell. Cf. *Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (London, 1854-56), vi, 159

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 884.



twelve queens, twelve games, by metonymy. At any rate, if he is speaking of the *one* game, he would have to say "*ferses fiftene*" to be accurate. On Skeat's allegorizing, I may quote Murray again. Caxton translated his *Game of Chess* from Vignay's version of Cessolis's *Liber de moribus hominum et nobilium*. Cessolis was the first to adopt this allegory, and of it Murray says, "This fanciful nomenclature never passed into general use."<sup>13</sup>

An attempt has been made to show that the dreamer was thinking of the game of draughts rather than of chess.<sup>14</sup> Stevenson feels as I do that Skeat's explanation is invalid; he goes on to show that draughts were played in England at that time and that *fers* might possibly have been used to indicate a piece in the game, but fails, in my opinion, to show sufficient reason for the sudden and unexplained (in the poem, that is) shift of reference. The association of femininity, which applies to both the *fers* in chess and the counter in draughts, would not have been in the forefront of the dreamer's mind, as he fails to understand the symbol the man in black uses. That both games were played on the same board hardly seems reason enough for the shift. There are associations between the two games, as Stevenson has pointed out, but he has not brought forth any reason strong enough to explain why the dreamer should refer to a wholly different game so suddenly.

The rime probably explains sufficiently the choice of the number twelve. Chaucer uses the *twelve-selve* rime six times in *The Book of the Duchess* (ll. 419-20, 463-64, 573-74, 723-24, 831-32, 1323-24). He does not use either word with another rime. Furthermore, twelve is a good round number (to many different peoples for curious reasons) and to Chaucer it has easy associations when numbers of companions are in question—twelve apostles, douzepers, etc.

This point of view would have occurred naturally to every reader had it not been for the definite article in line 723

Though ye had lost *the ferses* twelve.

The article occurs in every MS and makes the line easy to scan. However, for the sake of the sense I should favor emending the line by dropping it. This may seem a drastic solution, but two things

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 544 On the provenience of Caxton's book, see p. 547.

<sup>14</sup> S. W. Stevenson, "Chaucer's *Ferses Twelve*," *ELH* 7 (1940), pp. 215-222.

are to be said. First, the authorities for the text are all bad. In Robinson's words, "The authorities agree in supporting many readings which are either unsatisfactory in sense or metrically inferior. . . ." <sup>15</sup> See, for example, l. 660, where *the*, present in all MSS, must be omitted because it makes the line too long. Second, the resulting line will not be un-Chaucerian, at least for this poem. Compare l. 736,

Nolde not love her, and right thus,  
and l. 741.

Wolde for a fers make this woo,

in which a combination of consonants compensates for the loss of an unaccented syllable. Failure to recognize this principle has led both Skeat and Koch to amend l. 681 unnecessarily:

My wille, whan she my fers kaughte,  
to

My wille, whan my fers she kaughte.

Though omission of the article goes against the authorities and results in a line slightly less regular, it appears necessary to solve the difficulty; the sense of *fers* will no longer have to be strained, the mystery of *twelve* disappears, and the remark of the dreamer will make sense.

FRANKLIN D. COOLEY

*University of Maryland*

## DAISIES PIED AND ICICLES

No songs have been better loved or more admired than the two which constitute the anti-masque at the end of *Love's Labour's Lost*:—"When daisies pied" and "When icicles hang." John Masefield has called them "the loveliest thing ever said about England," and a small anthology in their praise could easily be compiled. Yet has any commentator ever called due attention to one of their most remarkable features, or offered to account for it? I refer to the fact that in the first song, which, as Mr. De la Mare felicitously observes, "sweeps before the eye a whole countryside—

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 1015.

meadow, hedge, and copse—fresh and sweet with spring,” the burden (in all senses) of the song falls upon a consideration which elsewhere in Shakespeare, as in life, makes toward tragedy, and ‘with this regard its current turns awry.’ A sour note, undeniably, even though an allowed Elizabethan jest. Whilst again, in the other song, the poet has marshaled reminders of the genuine physical discomforts of winter, adding one to another, to culminate in the hooting of the “staring” owl, which every generation has concurred in regarding as unmusical, depressing, even dismal and ill-omened.<sup>1</sup> And this, for the nonce, he perversely calls “a merry note.”

Let me hasten to acknowledge that the songs in their entirety convey no despondent impression. Rather, they leave us with a sense of two contrasting kinds of intense pleasure: the out-of-door enjoyment of delicious springtide, and the companionable, snug enjoyment of a winter fireside, the satisfying sense that all things disagreeable are shut out. It is just this paradox that calls for comment. “The excellence of every art,” Keats memorably declared, “is its intensity, capable of making all disagreeables evaporate from their being in close relationship with Beauty and Truth.” Here the magic has worked so powerfully as to have immobilized the natural process of thought.

But after paying homage to this supreme wizardry, let us revert to the fact and the question of content. Granted that everything flowers to beauty for Shakespeare, is there no special reason for his introducing not merely an obvious contrast that sets song against song, but also, and more subtly poised, this further conflict of elements within each separate song? Reduced to logical propositions, the first song says, in part, “The sum of vernal delights but serves to remind husbands of their fears of infidelity in their wives”; and the second, “The sum of winter’s annoyances but intensifies one’s sense of well-being (given fire and a pot).” Not to elaborate, it is, then, the age-old lesson of the imperfect and paradoxical condition of human felicity that is resident in this antiphony. And, surely, the meaning of so equivocal a comedy, with such a name, with such a dénouement, bitter-sweet, could not have been more exquisitely distilled and quintessentialized.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lady Macbeth’s words: “Hark! Peace! It was the owl that shriek’d, the fatal bellman, Which gives the stern’st good-night.”

With the view of one critic, Mr. Noble, I am obliged to reckon, for it is contiguous to my own, yet in such fashion as to be quite unacceptable. His first observation is not of main concern: it is that the songs "are used to get the characters off the stage."<sup>2</sup> Mr. Noble must here be speaking very loosely. A glance at the text, of course, shows instead that the songs are a means of bringing the whole cast back upon the stage by way of grand finale. Once back, it takes the very bald direction of Armado—"You that way; we this way"—to get them off again.

But, further, Mr. Noble sees both songs as 'merciless ridicule' of "pretty pastorals and sententious verses." He indicates some clowning on the part of the singer of the first song. After the "sly, echoing . . . 'Cuckoo, Cuckoo'—the singer shivers in pretended fear and shakes his head at the impropriety of such a call." And the second song he interprets as satire in which "pastoral romance gives way to pastoral realism." Not only does he regard the owl's hoot as "merry" only in an ironic sense—"a diversion where all else is depressing"; but proceeds, "the most disagreeable of all the sensations to be experienced in Winter is that afforded by the sight and smell of the sluttish Joan keeling the pot."<sup>3</sup> Although I ought perhaps to find my account with Mr. Noble, who of all the commentators that I have seen is the only one to discover any unpleasantness in the intention, yet I can hardly believe that the poet's humanity was so nice as to consider greasy Joan a repellent figure, while she busied herself over the fire, with the kettles steaming and the roasted "crabs" hissing in the bowl. Rather, as I take it, the aim is to suggest hearty enjoyment, not irony nor burlesque. Moreover, if "merry" be taken ironically, we spoil the pretty opposition between the boding bird of spring and the comfortable bird of winter, which itself makes a delightful surprise and reversal of the traditional "debate" of the birds that Armado has led us to anticipate. Surely, part of the fun lies in this unexpected flouting of convention; and if the reversal is not completed, the point is lost. Again, if "merry" be not honest, the structural parallel and contrast with the spring song are both obliterated, and our pleasure in the artistry and logical neatness of the antithesis is correspondingly impaired. Mr. Noble's reading is, however, in keeping with his sense of the play as a whole:—"satirical comedy, a forerunner of

<sup>2</sup> Richmond Noble, *Shakespeare's Use of Song*, Oxford, 1923, p. 19.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 33-6.

*Sir Fopling Flutter* and *The Way of the World*, and . . . absolutely devoid of any moral or serious intentions: . . . his nearest approach to the true comic attitude to life." To discuss this judgment in its particulars would be occupation for a long winter's evening; and then, if Joan must be banished, in compensation

benignius  
deprome quadrimum Sabina,  
o Thaliarche, merum diota.

BERTRAND H. BRONSON

*University of California*

### SIR HENRY GOODERE AND DONNE'S LETTERS

As a valuable study has shown, John Donne's *Letters to Several Persons of Honour* (1651) contains so many more letters to Sir Henry Goodere than to anyone else that the editor was at some pains to disguise the fact by printing more than a score with another name or different initials in the heading.<sup>1</sup> Yet, toward the end of the volume, not with the other letters to Goodere but with those to George Gerrard and Sir Robert Kerr, is a letter addressed "*To the Honourable Knight Sir Henry Goodere*" that cannot have been written to him: after an initial "Sir," the recipient is throughout called "your Lordship."<sup>2</sup> Though Donne's serious biographers have never suggested any occasion for the letter, they have generally assumed that it was addressed to the Earl of Somerset, apparently because the same part of the volume contains another letter to him as Viscount Rochester.<sup>3</sup> But the erroneous heading still remains unexplained. "This," as Mr. Bennett says, "is the last mistake which we should expect."<sup>4</sup>

Actually, if Donne wrote the letter, it was not to serve any purpose of his; what the 1651 volume prints is the draft of a letter addressed in 1609 to the Earl of Salisbury by Goodere himself. The

<sup>1</sup> R. E. Bennett, "*Donne's Letters to Several Persons of Honour*," *PMLA*, lvi (1941), 120-140

<sup>2</sup> *Letters* (1651), pp. 267-269

<sup>3</sup> Only G. C. Moore Smith, "Donniana," *MLR*, viii (1913), 49, noting the initial "Sir," has questioned that Somerset was the recipient. For an unfortunate attempt to provide the letter with a setting, see Hugh T'Anson Fausset, *John Donne: A Study in Discord* (London, [1924]), p. 218.

<sup>4</sup> *PMLA*, lvi (1941), 139

original in Goodere's hand and over his signature is still preserved at Hatfield House, where it reads as follows: <sup>5</sup>

May it please your Honor )

Because to remayne in this sort guilty in your Lo<sup>pps</sup>. opinion, doth not only defeate all my future endeavours but lay a heavier burden vpon mee of w<sup>ch</sup> I am more sensible, w<sup>ch</sup> is Ingratitude to yo<sup>r</sup> Lo<sup>pp</sup> to whose favour I have had so confident a recourse and have bene so much bound, I hope your Lo<sup>pp</sup>. will pardon mee this care w<sup>ch</sup> I vse to rectify my selfe towards you: to w<sup>ch</sup> purpose I humbly beseech yo<sup>r</sup> Lo<sup>pp</sup> to admitte thus much into yo<sup>r</sup> consideration That I neither hunted after that busines at first but tooke it when it was presented vnto mee and might perchance have fallen into worse handes, nor proceeded otherwise therein then to my poore discretion at that time seemed lawfull and requisite for my reputation, who held my selfe bound to give satisfaction to any who would doubt of the case Of all w<sup>ch</sup> if your Lo<sup>pp</sup>. were returned to yo<sup>r</sup> former opinion of mee you might bee pleased to make this some argument, that after his Ma<sup>ty</sup>. had showed his inclination to my first motion, I was not earnest to vrdge my aduantage of priority but was contented to joyne w<sup>th</sup> him who made a later petition And as soone as I vnderstood that my proceedings were distastfull I threw it downe at yo<sup>r</sup> Lo<sup>pps</sup>. feete and abandoned it, w<sup>ch</sup> it is necessary for mee to say at this time least if hee who joynd w<sup>th</sup> mee in that busines shall have proceeded any further since y<sup>t</sup> time yo<sup>r</sup> Lo<sup>pp</sup>. might bee suspicious of mee. That your Lo<sup>pps</sup>. name was at all vsed therein, or that any wordes of myne occasioned that error in others I am so sorry, as nothing but a conscience of guiltines of having purposed an injury to yo<sup>r</sup> Lo<sup>pp</sup> (w<sup>ch</sup> can never fall vpon mee) could affect mee more But I who to y<sup>e</sup> measure of my comprehension, have ever vnderstoode yo<sup>r</sup> Lo<sup>pps</sup>. nobility and evennes, cannot feare that yo<sup>r</sup> Lo<sup>pp</sup>. will punish an oversight like a cryme: w<sup>ch</sup> should bee effected vpon mee if yo<sup>r</sup> Lo<sup>pp</sup>. should continew yo<sup>r</sup> disfavour towards mee since no penalty could prove so burdensome to my mind and to my fortune as that; And since the repose of both consists in your Lo<sup>pps</sup>. favour I humbly entreat to bee restored vnto it, giving your Lo<sup>pp</sup> my fayth in pawne that I wilbee as wary in forfeiting it by a second occasion as I am sorry for this

Your Honors most  
humble poore  
servaunt

HGoodere

[Addressed.] To the right Hono my singular good Lorde the Earle of Salisbury Lo: highe Treasurer of Englande

<sup>5</sup> Cecil MSS, cxov, f. 101. The letter is endorsed "1609" and bound between manuscripts dated 31 March and 18 April. I am grateful to Lord Salisbury for permission to print the letter and also to Mr. J. V Lyle, the Librarian at Hatfield House, for answering certain questions about Goodere's letters to Salisbury, since here as elsewhere for Goodere's unprinted letters and verses I have depended upon photographic reproductions.

Though I do not know what circumstances prompted this explanation and apology, Goodere may have referred to the occasion among others when he complained to Buckingham ten years later that the king had given him "divers graunts of good valiew w<sup>ch</sup> were ever crossed by my Lo: of Salisbury and y<sup>e</sup> Howardes."<sup>6</sup>

Nor do I know why the letter was printed as Donne's. A copy of the draft may have been among Donne's genuine letters to Goodere, and perhaps it was earlier laid aside as anomalous only to be gathered up again later in the final haste to finish the volume.<sup>7</sup> But since almost all the other letters were apparently printed from holographs, why was it ever included at all, and how may one account for the obviously erroneous heading? The simplest assumption is that Donne himself composed the letter for Goodere and perhaps even sent it to him with the address as printed. There is little doubt that in 1612 Donne composed two letters for Sir Robert Drury.<sup>8</sup> The variants in the letter to Salisbury are certainly such as Goodere might have made as he prepared his fair copy; indeed some of them can best be explained if he was revising another's draft.<sup>9</sup> And there are other reasons for thinking this explanation not altogether unlikely.

For all his attempts at verse and prose, Goodere had little facility as a writer, and his later letters and verses provide curious testimony of his willingness to depend on Donne's greater skill. From 1619 until his death in 1627, as he addressed the great in an increasingly desperate attempt to repair his ruined fortune, he sometimes turned to letters that Donne had written him years before and

<sup>6</sup> Sackville MSS: see *Fourth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts* (London, 1874), p. 284. I am indebted to Lord Sackville for allowing me to have photographs made of the Goodere letters in his possession.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Bennett, *PMLA*, LVI (1941), 139: "This last part of the *Letters to Severall Persons* betrays editorial haste and carelessness. Only the roughest effort was made to alternate Ker and Garrard letters, and the headings were not tampered with, but seem to have been printed rather closely from the endorsements."

<sup>8</sup> See R. E. Bennett, "Donne's Letters from the Continent in 1611-12," *PQ*, XIX (1940), 69-70, 74-75.

<sup>9</sup> Note especially Goodere's "my first motion" for "the first motion made in my behalf" and "that error in others" for "such an error in my servant."

simply appropriated passages for his own use.<sup>10</sup> Two examples, selected from others only because they happen to suggest emendations to Donne's printed text, will illustrate the point. In the draft of a letter to the Marquis of Hamilton, Goodere paraphrased a sentence from one of Donne's Mitcham letters:

*Goodere*

I have seene not only clothes and stuffes and oathes and phrases and countenances but also some men in fashion, and suddaynly againe abandoned w<sup>th</sup> as litle reason as they were taken<sup>11</sup>

*Donne*

I have ever seen in *London* and our Court, as some colours, and habits, and continuances, and motions, and phrases, and accents, and songs, so friends in fashion and in season: and I have seen them as sodainly abandoned altogether, though I see no change in them, nor know more why they were left, then why they were chosen<sup>12</sup>

More striking is the use that Goodere made of another Mitcham letter as he recited his history to Buckingham in 1619:

*Goodere*

This I made account I did early when by my parents care I vnder-tooke y<sup>e</sup> study of our lawes but was diverted by a voluptuous desire of humaner learning and languadges, good ornaments to greate fortunes but myne needed an occupation and a course. That I considered againe, and thought I entred well into when active times I looked into y<sup>e</sup> warres. But there I stumbled too, first by the death of my Lo: of Essex: and after by y<sup>e</sup> Queenes . . . After

*Donne*

This I made account that I begun early, when I understood the study of our laws but was diverted by the worst voluptuousness, which is an Hydroptique immoderate desire of humane learning and languages. beautifull ornaments to great fortunes, but mine needed an occupation, and a course which I thought I entred well into, when I submitted my self to such a service, as I thought might imploied [*sic*] those poor advantages, which I had. And

<sup>10</sup> See *Letters* (1651), pp 197-198, for evidence that Goodere sometimes also appropriated Donne's verse.

<sup>11</sup> State Papers Domestic, James I, *CLXXX*, No 15 This and Nos. 16-17, which are also drafts, show Goodere struggling to compose both verse and prose. All are undated but belong to about 1624.

<sup>12</sup> *Letters* (1651), pp. 27-28. (The letter is headed "*To Sir H. R.*," but since Jessopp everyone has recognized that Goodere was the recipient) G. C. Moore Smith, "Donniana," *Modern Language Quarterly*, iv (1901), 91, noted that "continuances" should probably be "countenances," and Izaak Walton long ago made the same correction in another letter: J. E. Butt, "Walton's Copy of Donne's *Letters* (1651)," *RES*, viii (1932), 72.



## Goodere

all this I thought I beganne happily againe when I was preferred at y<sup>e</sup> happy entrance of his Ma<sup>ty</sup>. to such a service as I thought then might imploy those poore aduantage I had . . . I would not that death should take mee a sleepe and only declare mee to bee deade. If I must shipwracke I would doe it in a sea where my impotency my [sic] have some excuse, not in a sullen weedy lake where I cannot have so much as exercise for my swimming.<sup>13</sup>

## Donne

there I stumbled too, yet I would try again. . . . I would not that death should take me asleep. I would not have him meerly seise me, and onely declare me to be dead, but win me, and overcome me. When I must shipwrack, I would do it in a Sea, where mine impotencie might have some excuse; not in a sullen weedy lake, where I could not have so much as exercise for my swimming.<sup>14</sup>

These passages and others like them indicate, I think, that Goodere would always have welcomed Donne's help.

Goodere, moreover, at least once did ask Donne to compose letters. While still at Mitcham, Donne replied to such a request, and though his letter is not unambiguous, he scarcely had sufficient influence at the time to make it likely that the letters were to be sent in his own name. "I have obeyed you drowsily, and coldly," Donne writes, "as the night and my indisposition commanded. yet perchance those hindrances have done good, for so your Letters are the lesse curious, in which, men of much leasure may soon exceed, when they write of businesse, they having but a little." He further explains that he is not sending two other letters that Goodere had asked for, because he does not believe that they would be helpful "in a businesse wholly relating to this house," and adds that, in his opinion, the "good Countesse" is also "not a proper Mediatrix to those persons."<sup>15</sup> If Donne wrote the letter to Salisbury, it is also

<sup>13</sup> Sackville MSS: see note 6 above. Goodere was admitted to the Middle Temple on 23 April 1589. *Middle Temple Records*, ed. Charles Henry Hopwood, 4 vols. (London, 1904-1905), I, 305 (cf. I, 308, 311, 315, 317, 320). In 1599, he accompanied Essex to Ireland, where he was knighted.

<sup>14</sup> *Letters* (1651), pp. 51, 50. (In Donne's letter the second passage occurs first). Goodere makes almost certain that Donne wrote "undertook" (not "understood") and "imploy" (not "employed"), but though I cannot explain Goodere's "humaner," I do not believe that Donne did not write "humane" Walton inserted a "haue" between "might" and "employed" in his copy of the *Letters* and also substituted "abilities" for "advantages," conjectures that Goodere's letter shows are ill founded: Butt, *R&S*, VIII (1932), 73.

<sup>15</sup> *Letters* (1651), pp. [192]-193.

"lesse curious" than some of his others. But whether he wrote it or not, his biographers need no longer attempt to explain it by studying his relations with Somerset or any other Lord.

STANLEY JOHNSON

*University of California*

### SAM. JOHNSON'S WORD-HOARD

"Dictionaries," said Johnson, "are like watches; the worst is better than none, and the best cannot be expected to go quite true." The question naturally comes up, How accurate was Johnson's chronometer for 1755? We know, of course, that some of his definitions, like *pastern* (the knee of a horse), had to be corrected in later editions, and we know that many of his etymologies, like *shamefaced* (*shame* plus *face*), were wrong. But such trivial lapses in the working of a stupendous mechanism count for little or nothing. A much more pertinent question is How well did Johnson represent the language used in the first half of the eighteenth century and the language to be found in the literature of the preceding two centuries, that is, from Spenser to his own day? Put in other terms, Of the words in *A New English Dictionary* with quotations between 1550 and 1750 what percentage did Johnson get?

In the collection of statistics some allowance has to be made for Johnson's bases of inclusion and rejection. In the "Preface" he said: "Compound or double words I have seldom noted, except when they obtain a signification different from that which the components have in their simple state. Thus *highwayman*, *woodman*, and *horsecourse* require an explanation; but of *thieflike* or *coach-driver* no notice was needed, because the primitives contain the meanings of the compounds. Words arbitrarily formed by constant and settled analogy, like diminutive adjectives in *ish* . . . adverbs in *ly* . . . substantives in *ness* . . . were less diligently sought, and sometimes have been omitted. . . ." So, too, verbal nouns and participles were not regularly presented, "because they are commonly to be understood, without any danger of mistake, by consulting the verb." All these forms, it is needless to say, appear in the *NED*; they were not included, however, in the following analysis.

1690 entries in the *NED* were inspected. They included samplings of A's, B's, M's, N's, R's, S's, and Z's. Of these words 696 appear in Johnson. That is to say, Johnson exhibited approximately 40% of the words used between 1550 to 1750. When these entries for the different letters of the alphabet are compared, however, a startling fact comes to light, namely that Johnson's coverage of the first letters, A and B, is nearly 50%, while that of the later letters sinks steadily, until Z is reached, where he seems to have picked up only some 26%. If we make the not illogical assumption that he began composition with the A's and finished with the Z's, we seem to have proof that Johnson tired of his work as he went along. And we can better appreciate the passage in Boswell which records, "He said he had taken longer time than he needed to have done in composing his Dictionary."

To conclude that the last half of his compilation is hurried or fragmentary would not be correct, for the truth seems to be that Johnson cut down on the words of dubious currency as he progressed through the alphabet. This may be proved by a reexamination of the entries. If the *NED* words marked *obsolete*, *dialect*, *archaic*, *Scotticism*, and *foreign* be eliminated, the averages show no significant deterioration through the alphabet. On this basis the first half of the *Dictionary* contains about 85% of the possible words; the second half (M to Z) contains about 75%. Put another way, as Johnson progressed, he paid less and less attention to words with an antiquarian flavor. His coverage from A to Z represented a consistently high percentage of words current in 1750,—approximately 80%.

The next query that comes to mind is What words did Johnson omit? For one thing, he left out a large number of words which had been used in the sixteenth century but which were no longer used in 1755. The following examples are typical: *shelden* (last entry in *NED*, 1674), *beaupleader* (1700), *beath* (1653), and *zizany* (1612). Since practically all the words which Johnson included are to be found in a medium-sized dictionary today, one is inclined to believe that his omission of a word may have been the reason for its complete oblivion. In any event, the loss of such words is not to be regretted today, for as Johnson wrote in the *Rambler*: "Life is surely given us for higher purposes than to gather what our ancestors have wisely thrown away."

A second general consideration is Johnson's coverage of technical and trade terms. Of this difficulty Johnson said in his "Preface":

I could not visit caverns to learn the miner's language, nor take a voyage to perfect my skill in the dialect of navigation, nor visit the warehouses of merchants, and shops of artificers, to gain the names of wares, tools and operations, of which no mention is found in books

Actually his representation of this class of words is far from complete. He left out *mahogany*, *magic-lantern*, *blende*, *magnesia*, *borax*, *cadmia*, *zinc*, and *soda*. In view of Johnson's later experiments in chemistry in Thrale's back yard, the omission of the last five is strange. He did not include *bumble-bee* or *zebra*, though he had used the latter word in translating Lobo's *Abyssina*. So, too, *malconduct*, used in his *Parliamentary Debates*, is not to be found in the *Dictionary*. Other omissions are *shedder* (a feminine sheep) and *rosmarine*, both used by his well-loved Spenser; Shakespeare's *nemesis*; *abaddon* and *shibboleth* from Milton, *rosicrucian* and *zigzag* from Pope.

The final question is Are these omissions merely lapses, or are they, by any chance, deletions? Some of the words were evidently not known, or at least not thought of, by Johnson. In this category are words like *blond*, *roster*, *malaria*, and *maroon*. But other words were thoughtfully left out. We can be sure of this because we know that Johnson made use of Bailey's *Dictionary Britannicum*, and a comparison of the two shows that the later lexicographer deliberately left out some of Bailey's words,—words, incidentally, which have survived. Among these are *zinc*, *zebra*, *shibboleth*, *root* (in mathematics), *borax* and *cadmia*. Why Johnson rejected these words in Bailey is beyond all conjecture. On the other hand one may guess with some possibility of success why Johnson omitted Bailey's *sodomy* and *penis*. Then, too, it may have been the implication of Gallic encroachment that caused him to shy away from Bailey's *zero*, "a name given to a cipher especially by the French," although it should be noted that Johnson was by no means against the inclusion of such French terms as *bourgeois* and *burlesque*. And it may be surmised that he rejected the well-known *rosicrucian* because he was unalterably opposed to such nonsense.

The conclusion is one that Johnson anticipated; even the best dictionary did not go quite true. But its virtues far exceed its miscarriages. And before any scholar yelps carpingly at the discovery that Johnson collected only eighty percent of the roots current in his day, let him recall Johnson's observation that the study of textual problems "refrigerates the mind and diverts the thoughts from the principal study."

GEORGE S. McCUE

## A NOTE ON JAMES THOMSON'S SOURCES

In calling attention to James Thomson's delightful picture of "Insect-Lamps" that nightly illuminated the winding river Menam in Siam, Mr. Alan D. McKillop<sup>1</sup> correctly offers the description in Harris's *Travels* as the parallel to the poetic account. Thomson, indeed, has shown himself indebted to this compendium of exploration all through *The Seasons*. The connection here, however, is more complex than the mere relating of that one scene on the Menam to the verses.

Ninety lines earlier than this, Thomson has a passage describing tropical birds of all plumage that swarm about an unidentified river.<sup>2</sup> These lines are a segment of that catalogue of the great tropical rivers, of which the Siamese river Menam was but one. The passage is as follows:

Wide o'er the winding Umbrage of the Floods,  
Like vivid Blossoms glowing from afar,  
Thick-swarm the brighter Birds. For Nature's Hand  
That with sportive Vanity has deck'd  
The plummy Nations, there her gayest Hues  
Profusely pours But if she bids them shine,  
Array'd in all the beauteous Beams of Day,  
Yet frugal still, she humbles them in Song.  
Nor envy we the gaudy Robes they lent  
Proud Montezuma's Realm, whose Legions cast  
A boundless Radiance waving on the Sun,  
While Philomel is ours, while in our Shades,  
Thro' the soft Silence of the listening Night,  
The sober-suited Songstress trills her lay.<sup>3</sup>

His footnote to this passage is also important: "In all Regions of the Torrid Zone the Birds, tho' more beautiful in their Plumage, are observed to be less melodious than ours."

Between this curious generalization about birds—their blossom-like appearance in the trees, the contrast of their brilliance with the

<sup>1</sup> *The Background of Thomson's Seasons*, Minneapolis, 1942, pp. 158-59.

This was the subject of my dissertation at Yale University in 1941. Thomson's remarkable poetical adaptations of foreign scenes and characteristics from a wide selection of books on travel and science, to which we know he had access, was a probability which lured us into similar discoveries.

<sup>2</sup> *Thomson's Seasons. Critical Edition*, ed. Otto Zippel, Berlin, 1908, "Summer," 725-38 (Text C).

<sup>3</sup> *Loc. cit.*

dullness in color of more northerly birds—and the later reference to the firefly studded Siamese river, there is a striking bond which Thomson himself either was unaware of or had no intention of revealing. As Mr. McKillop has pointed out, Harris has incorporated a translation into English from a French account by Guy Tachard of the voyage of six Jesuits to Siam.<sup>4</sup> Here Thomson found the description of the fireflies, which Mr. McKillop quotes.<sup>5</sup> But on the same page (whether Thomson had been reading Harris's English version, which is most probable, or the original French publication) he would also have run into this account of the color effect of swarms of white herons or "aigrettes" perching among the rich foliage beside the Menam:

But of all the Birds that delight the Sight, nothing can be pleasanter than the vast Number of *Criel-Herons*, which swarm upon the trees, and at a Distance one would take them for their Blossoms . . . It is of a neat Proportion of Body, and hath Feathers as white as Snow, it hath Tops of Tufts upon the Head, Back and Belly, in which its chief Beauty consists, and which render it extraordinary pretty the White of these birds mingled with the Green of the Trees, on which they set in Flocks, makes the most lovely Landship [sic] imaginable<sup>6</sup>

He would also have read in the preceding paragraph on that same page of Harris, "In fine: All the wild Birds have most lovely Feathers, and that of various Colours, as Red, Yellow, Blue, and Green, and that in great numbers"<sup>7</sup> And, finally, two paragraphs before the observation on the "Criel-Herons," he had undoubtedly read:

All sorts of Volatiles do multiply extreamly at Siam, for the very Heat of the Climate will almost hatch their Eggs alone, yet 'twill appear, perhaps, something strange and singular to us (altho' it be common to Brasil, and, perhaps, all other hot Countries) that almost all their Birds are beautiful to the Eyes, but very unpleasant to the Ear There are several sorts that imitate the Voice, and all have some Cry, but no wrabbling [sic] Note or sweet Singing.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *Voyage de Siam Des Peres Jesuites, Envoyes par le Roy, aux Indes & à la Chine*, Paris, 1686 The same account also appears, through what relationship I am not quite sure, in M. De la Loubiere's *Du Royaume de Siam*, Paris, 1691, an account of travels made during 1687-88 (a year after that of the six Jesuits). Harris prints his English translation under the heading "Relation of M. De la Loubere [i.e. Loubiere], the French King's Envoy Extraordinary to the K. of Siam."

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 159.

<sup>6</sup> John Harris, *Navigantium atque Itinerantium Bibliotheca*, London, 1705, II, 468.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 467.

Then the observer notes, a little farther along, that in these climes "they have no Nightingales or Canary-Birds."

To all these pictures of Tachard, phrases from Thomson's lines, already quoted, may be related. Thus, Tachard's fowl "swarm upon the Trees"—which border, incidentally, a river he has characterized two pages earlier by its "divers *Maeanders*." Thomson's "brighter Birds" "thick-swarm" over the "winding Umbrage of the Floods." To Tachard, "The White of these Birds," when seen "at a distance" among the trees, suggests "Blossoms"; while to Thomson, "the brighter Birds" are "Like vivid Blossoms glowing from afar." And Tachard's conclusion that "they have no Nightingales or Canary-Birds" in this part of the world is embroidered upon in Thomson's belief that "while Philomel is ours [Britain's]," the British need have no envy of those richly ornamented tropical birds "arrayed in all the beauteous Beams of Day."

One more picture can be added to Thomson's tropical scene. Whether by conscious reference or by a lively association of related images, he has drawn a final thread of color into his bird pattern from Richard Hakluyt, that familiar collector of voyages we need hardly pause to link to the poet's reading.<sup>9</sup> There, on page 469 of the original edition, is Henry Hawks' "A Relation of commodities of Nova Hispania," which says that the great emperor "had all kinde of beasts which were then in the countrey, and all maner of birds." And "always whensoever he went out of his Court to passe the time, he was borne upon 4. of his noble mens shoulders set upon a table, some say, of golde, and very richly dressed with feathers of divers and many colours and flowers [i. e. garments *flowered* in designs worked from the plumage of birds]."<sup>10</sup>

Thomson's is a composite and abstracted account of the rarities of a tropical river. It is remarkable, I believe, because he welded so many *particulars* and downright observations into his passages intended to be unlocated vignettes. Also, a point here is that Thomson annotated his fireflies yet remained silent on the other direct references to the Menam River and Henry Hawks' Montezuman finery.

HORACE E. HAMILTON

*Rutgers University*

<sup>9</sup> Letter to Mallet, *Miscellanies of the Philobiblon Society*, London, 1857-58, IV, 38-39.

<sup>10</sup> Richard Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation*, London, 1598-1600, III, 469.

# TWAIN AS FORERUNNER OF TOOTH-AND-CLAW CRITICISM

A withering appraiser of books and authors, Mark Twain has yet to be credited for the possible impetus his eruptive antipathies and enthusiasms have given to the American drift toward trenchant style in criticism. With only moderate exaggeration he could say of the criticizing of books: "... I don't do it except when I hate them."<sup>1</sup>

To Twain, Goldsmith's *Vicar of Wakefield* is "one long waste-pipe discharge of goody-goody puerilities and dreary moralities; a book which is full of pathos which revolts, and humor which grieves the heart."<sup>2</sup> He sneers at Leather Stocking: "Cooper hadn't any more invention than a horse; and I don't mean a high-class horse, either, I mean a clothes-horse."<sup>3</sup> "Master of common-places," he calls John Hotten; and then, "... I feel as if I wanted to take a broomstraw and knock the man's brains out."<sup>4</sup> Characteristic, too, is his passing reference, through Huck Finn, to *The Pilgrim's Progress*—"about a man that left his family, it didn't say why."<sup>5</sup>

To Robert L. Stevenson, Twain says: "Aldrich was always brilliant . . . he will always be brilliant; he will be brilliant in hell—you will see."<sup>6</sup> As for Jane Austen, "Every time I read *Pride and Prejudice* I want to dig her up and beat her over the skull with her own shinbone."<sup>7</sup>

Personal, vituperative, iconoclastic criticism reached its apothe-

<sup>1</sup> Albert B. Paine, *Mark Twain: A Biography* (New York, 1912), II, 1094.

<sup>2</sup> *Following the Equator* (1897) in *Writings of Mark Twain* (New York, 1899-1912), VI, 312.

<sup>3</sup> "Fenimore Cooper's Literary Offenses" (1895) in *Writings*, XXII, 84. The article begins with acid references to those eminent critics who praised Cooper's literature "without having read some of it"

<sup>4</sup> Letter to the London *Spectator* (Sept 20, 1872), reprinted in *Bookman*, XXXIII (April, 1911), 115.

<sup>5</sup> *Huckleberry Finn* (1885), in *Writings*, XIII, 141.

<sup>6</sup> "Chapters from My Autobiography," *North American Review*, CLXXXIII (September, 1906), 457.

<sup>7</sup> In a letter quoted by Brander Matthews, "Mark Twain and the Art of Writing," *Harper's Magazine*, CXLI (October, 1920), 642.



osis in nineteenth-century America in Twain. And what critic during the past century, other than Twain, has blasted Sir Walter Scott, George Eliot, and Mary Baker Eddy with such contempt for prevailing opinion? Clearly Shaw, Mencken, DeVoto—Twainolators all of them from their early, formative years, by their own admission—and a horde of modern journalistic reviewers inherit, remotely or directly, something of Twain's failing quality, his aggressive, epithetic line.

GEORGE W. FEINSTEIN

*University of North Dakota*

### UGUICCIÓN ON THE NAME OF Y

Near the beginning of the letter I in his *Magnae derivationes* Uguccione da Pisa says:

And note that this Latin character I and this Greek character y represent the same element, the former in its substantial but y in its accidental sound. For I sounds this element naturally thinly, therefore this character I represents that element when it sounds more thinly, but when it sounds more thickly and more fully it is represented by this character y, for those different manners of representing the aforesaid element. The Greeks use the aforesaid two characters, calling I iota and y *gui*. We however do not use that character y except in Greek or barbarian words—not everywhere. Wherefore in many Greek or barbarian words it is doubtful whether they are to be written by us with I or with y, as those words are wholly unknown to us; since by them, that is, the Greeks or barbarians, I is written in some places, and in others *gui*, that is, y.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>"Et nota quod hec figura latina I et hec figura y. greca idem elementum representant illud in substantiali sono. sed .y in accidentali. I enim hoc elementum naturaliter exiliter sonat. ergo hec figura .I. representat illud elementum cum sonat exilius sed cum sonat spissius et huberius representatur hac figura y ad istos diuersos modos representandi predictum elementum. Greci predictis duabus figuris utuntur appellantes .I. iota .y. *gui*. Nos vero non utimur figura ista y. nisi in grecis dictionibus uel barbaris. et non ubique. Vnde in multis dictionibus grecis uel barbaris est dubium an debeant scribi per I. an per .y apud nos. cum nescimus ex toto illas. quia apud illos. scilicet grecos uel barbaros. in quibusdam locis scribitur I. in aliis *gui* scilicet y."—This is from Roto-graph of the Bodleian MS Laud. 626: Library of Congress, Modern Language Association Deposit, No. 30 (with some slight modifications in the "punctuation").

This assertion that the Greeks called their upsilon "gui" shows that Uguiccione was thinking of the majuscule Greek Y; and one wonders how he came by the name. A good deal has been written about the older names of our Y. the various opinions were summed up by E. S. Sheldon in two articles in the first two numbers of the *Harvard Studies and notes in philology and literature*,<sup>2</sup> and again fairly recently by C. D. Buck in *The Manly anniversary studies in language and literature*.<sup>3</sup> As a sort of postscript to his second article Sheldon quotes from Holthausen, *ZFSL*, XV, 172, with the remark that the latter's explanation of the name *wī* "is very likely the correct one":

*wī* . . can originally have designated only the Y of the Gothic alphabet, used by Wulfila to designate the spirant *w*, since it had this value in the combination *aw*, *ew* in fourth century Greek. Elsewhere it was pronounced as in Modern Greek, with loss of rounding, as *ι*, and from this may come the *ι* in the name of the letter—unless one may perhaps point to the Greek names *μῦ*, *νῦ* (pronounced *mī*, *nī*), *ξί*, *πί*, *φί*, *χί*, *ψί*. . . . Y has in the Gothic alphabet itself the double value of spirant *w* and of vocalic *y* . . . .<sup>4</sup>

Sheldon's own original explanation of the name is termed by Buck "complicated and unconvincing"; and of Holthausen's view Buck demands: "But is it not most improbable that the value of Y in the Gothic alphabet should have any bearing on the name current in Western Europe?"

In view of the continued interest shown by scholars in the name of the letter Y, and of the fact that Uguiccione's lexicon has never been printed,<sup>5</sup> it seems well that this statement of his, dating from about the year 1200, should be here presented for the record.

H. D. AUSTIN

*University of Southern California*

<sup>2</sup> Vol I, 1892, pp 66-87: "The origin of the English names of the letters of the alphabet"; Vol. II, 1893, pp 155-171. "Further notes on the names of the letters"

<sup>3</sup> 1923, pp. 340-350 "The letter Y."

<sup>4</sup> "*wī* . . . kann ursprünglich nur das Y des gotischen Alphabets bezeichnet haben, von Wulfila zur Bezeichnung des spirantischen *w* gebraucht, weil es in der Lautverbindung *aw*, *ew* im Griech des 4 Jahrh. diesen Wert besass. Sonst wurde es wie im Neugriech. mit Entrundung als *ι* ausgesprochen, und daher mag das *ι* im Namen des Buchstabens stammen, wenn man nicht vielleicht an die griech Namen *μῦ*, *νῦ* (gespr. *mī*, *nī*), *ξί*, *πί*, *φί*, *χί*, *ψί* erinnern darf. . . . Y hat im gotischen Alphabet selbst die doppelte Geltung als Spirans *w* und als Vokal *y* . . . ."

<sup>5</sup> And probably will not be, for a long time: now that the projected edition under the direction of Professor Aristide Marigo is in abeyance.

## THE MERIT OF MALKYN

Skeat's note to *Piers the Plowman*, Pass. 1, l. 182 (B text) says that *Malkyn* "was a proverbial name for an unchaste slattern,"<sup>1</sup> and refers to its use by Chaucer in the *Man of Law's Prologue*, l. 30. There, true enough, Chaucer uses the word in this sense:

It wol not come agayn withouten drede  
Na moore than wole Malkynes maydenhede  
Whan she hath lost it in hir wantownesse.

But Skeat has evidently been misled by similarity of wording, for this meaning does not easily fit the lines in *Piers the Plowman*:

For thouȝ ȝe be trewe of ȝour tonge . and trewlich wyne,  
And as chaste as a child that in cherech wepeth,  
But if ȝe louen lelliche . and lene the poure,  
Such good as god ȝow sent godelich parteth,  
ȝe ne haue na more meryte in masse ne in houres  
Than Malkyn of hire maydenhode . that no man desireth

Presumably, Skeat took the last part to mean that the rich (who are being addressed) have no more merit than *Malkyn* has maidenhood—i. e., none at all. But this drops the last half line flat, without any clear sense. It may be translated "who desires no man" or "whom no man desires,"<sup>2</sup> but neither suits the idea of a wanton, unless, taking the latter, one stretch it to mean that *Malkyn* is so far gone in wantonness as to be no longer desirable.

The *NED* quotations show that *Malkyn* was used as no more than a typical lower-class familiar female name from the late thirteenth century onward, and that though the connotation of wantonness was often present it was not a necessary part of the meaning. In the present passage, as I take it, *Malkyn* is used in this less specific sense; she is not a wanton. She is desired by no man, and therefore is possessed of maidenhood. Hers is a negative virtue; she is chaste because she has not been tempted, not because she has resisted temptation.

The point of the comparison, then, is that negative virtue has no true merit. Though ye be honest in speech, and chaste, prayers and

<sup>1</sup> So the Oxford ed. of the first seven passus. In the EETS and Clarendon editions by Skeat the note reads, "The context shews that *Malkyn* is here equivalent to a wanton, but ugly slattern." That she is ugly is evidently his inference from "that no man desireth."

<sup>2</sup> C text gives "wham" instead of the ambiguous "that."

church-going will gain you nothing; merit lies only in positive charity and love of the poor. This bears out the larger intention of the passage, which is to expound the texts that precede and follow it.

þe same mesures þat ȝe mete    amys other elles,  
ȝe shullen ben weyen þer-wyth    whan ȝe wende hennes

And,

That faith with-oute þe faite    is riȝte no þinge worthi.

Thus *Malkyn*, in this passage, denotes no more than a lower-class woman. In this instance she is undesired, which connotes ugliness, slatternliness, or the like. That she is not a wanton, but is chaste by default, makes the moral point: her virtue, being negative, has no merit. Beyond this the comparison between the rich and Malkyn cannot be carried in either interpretation, for Langland is enjoining generosity only upon the former.

FREDERIC G. CASSIDY

*University of Wisconsin*

#### A NOTE ON CHAUCER'S *TALE OF MELIBEE*

At line 1495 of Chaucer's *Tale of Melibee*, Prudence says, "For the poete seith that 'we oghte paciently taken the tribulacions that comen to us, whan we thynken and consideren that we han diserved to have hem.'" <sup>1</sup> In his note on this line Professor Robinson points out that "the poete" is not mentioned in the Latin text of Albertano of Brescia, the original of the story of Prudence and Melibee, and is unidentified. Professor Skeat, in his note on the passage, <sup>2</sup> compares Luke XXIII, 41 "*Et nos quidem juste, nam digna factis recipimus; hic vero nihil mali gessit.*" This passage is related only to part of Chaucer's line and does not help to identify "the poete."

Chaucer's *Tale of Melibee* (as is well known) is a close translation of Renaud's *Livre de Melibee et Prudence* which in turn is an adaptation of *Liber Consolationis et Consilii* of Albertano of Brescia. <sup>3</sup> Renaud's text contains the source of Chaucer's line:

<sup>1</sup> F. N. Robinson (ed.), *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Boston, 1933, p. 215.

<sup>2</sup> W. W. Skeat (ed.), *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Oxford, 1894, v, 218.

<sup>3</sup> J. Burke Severs, "The Tale of Melibeus," in *Sources and Analogues of*

"Car li poetes di<sup>t</sup> que nous devons porter en pacience les tribulations qui nous viennent, quant nous pensons que nous les avon bien desservies."<sup>4</sup>

I wish to suggest that "the poete" may have been a versifier of *De Duodecim Utilitatibus Tribulationis* ascribed to Peter of Blois or of a French translation thereof. This treatise discusses the reasons for God's visiting tribulations on man and the proper ways patiently to receive them. Ideologically the treatise is very close to the passage from "the poete" quoted by Renaud and Chaucer. The popularity of the treatise and hence the likelihood of its having been versified and known to Renaud are attested to by the considerable number of manuscripts (some of later date) in which it existed in translations into both English and French.<sup>5</sup>

In the fifteenth century an English poet versified Peter's treatise under the title of the *Twelve Profits of Anger*.<sup>6</sup> Two quotations from this poem may serve to show how close an earlier versified version may have been to "the poete's" statement:

...  
And so may we beste pacyence here  
And þenke we were worthy soche thre  
To suffre for owre synnes sere  
... (Stanza 2)  
...  
If we thenke þ<sup>t</sup> we ben worthy  
To haue anger here for owre mysdede  
... (Stanza 9)

JAMES R. KREUZER

*Queens College*

*Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, edited by W. F. Bryan and G. Dempster, Chicago, 1941, p. 560 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 596.

- |   |                                    |
|---|------------------------------------|
| <sup>5</sup> MS Royal 17 B xviii (Eng.) | MS Corpus Christi Coll. Oxford 220 |
| MS Royal 17 A xxv (Eng.)                | (Eng.)                             |
| MS Royal 17 C xviii (Eng.)              | MS John Rylands Libr. 94 (Eng.)    |
| MS Laud 210 (Eng.)                      | MS Plimpton Libr. 256 f. 35 (Eng.) |
| MS Camb. Univ. Libr. Ii iv 9            | MS Arundel 286 (Eng.)              |
| (Eng.)                                  | MS B. M. Add. 28549 (French)       |
| MS Harley 1706 (Eng.)                   | MS B. M. Add. 39843 (French)       |
| MS Rawlinson C 894 (Eng.)               | MS Royal 16 E xii (French)         |

(See J. E. Wells, *Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1400*, and *Supplements*, New Haven, Connecticut, 1926 et seq., Chap. xi, no. 39; also C. Horstmann, *Yorkshire Writers, Richard Rolle of Hampole*, New York, 1896).

<sup>6</sup> J. R. Kreuzer (ed.), "The Twelve Profits of Anger," *PMLA*, LIII, 80 ff.

## TWO CHAUCER ALLUSIONS: 1819 AND 1899

In her indispensable collection of Chaucer allusions, Miss Caroline Spurgeon was able to offer only partial information for one allusion because she had access merely to a review in *The Gentleman's Magazine* and not to the book itself.<sup>1</sup> My coming upon this volume in a bookshop makes it possible to present the allusion in its entirety, to establish the date, and to identify the author.

The book is *Childe Harold in the Shades: An Infernal Roman* (London, 1819); this particular copy is bound with *Pastorals, Ruggiero, with Other Poems*. By E. D. Baynes, Esq., Translator of Ovid's Epistles; Author of *Childe Harold in the Shades* (London, 1819). Thus we can identify the author of the following two stanzas, only the first of which appeared in *The Gentleman's Magazine* and in Miss Spurgeon's book.

## XLVI

In antique vest array'd stands CHAUCER there,  
Telling quaint stories to a listening throng;  
Maid, widow, wife, old, young, ill-favour'd, fair,  
Cruel and yielding, in his motley song  
Together flow'd unpolish'd, rough, but strong,  
And full of fire the merry notes he us'd,  
Rightly to him our earliest bays belong,  
Though much by modern copyists abus'd,  
Who imitate the faults the age in him excus'd

## XLVII

But innocent of wit, they strive to shroud  
Their modern common-place in garb antique;  
Vain hope! know, fools, how dark soe'er the cloud  
With which your own no-meaning you would seek  
To veil, dulness and nonsense loudly speak  
The work your own; for pygmies cannot span  
The grasp of giants. things of scarce a week  
Bear not the test of ages; so the man  
Ye imitate in vain, his dress is all ye can.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See C. F. E. Spurgeon, *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion (1357-1900)*, Part II (Section 1), "Chaucer Society Publications, Second Series," Nos. 49 and 50 (London, 1918), pp. 119-20, *The Gentleman's Magazine*, Vol. LXXXIX, Part I (April, 1819), pp. 336-7.

<sup>2</sup> See E. D. Baynes, *Childe Harold in the Shades* (London, 1819), p. 24; these two stanzas, from Canto I, are alluded to in the "Argument" (p. vi), where Baynes writes: "He also vieweth the shades of Dr. Johnson and Dan Chaucer."

Another allusion, eighty years later, is found in "A Dunnet Shepherdess," the second story in Sarah Orne Jewett's volume, *The Queen's Twin* (Boston and New York, 1899), page 64:

It was long before my own interest began to flag; there was a flavor of the best sort in her definite and descriptive fashion of speech. It may be only a fancy of my own that in the sound and value of many words, with their lengthened vowels and doubled cadences, there is some faint survival on the Maine coast of the sound of English speech of Chaucer's time.

ROBERT A. PRATT

Queens College

---

### "THE TRIPLE TUN" AGAIN

Several months ago in this journal (LXII, 191-192) a note appeared on Ben Jonson's "The Triple Tun," in which attention was called to an indenture relating to the sale of the Three Tonnes and suggesting that, on the basis of the information contained therein, modern readers might reasonably assume that the establishment was a rather elaborate one. Dr. Giles Dawson, Curator of Books and Manuscripts in the Folger Shakespeare Library, informs me that that institution has purchased the document cited, which, as indicated in footnote 2, was quoted from Catalogue 343 of Myers and Company. He tells me that the bookseller's transcription contains several errors, the chief of which are *sellers* for *Sollers* and *easements* for *casements*. Any one interested will doubtless want to consult the original at the Folger Library.

More important is Dr. Dawson's correction of my conclusion. He has kindly consented to allow me to print it:

I do not think you can reasonably assume anything as to the size and importance of the establishment from the enumeration of the appurtenances. In land transfers such long enumerations are always present and are for the purpose of covering every *possible* item rather than for that of actually listing the appurtenances. For example a bargain and sale of land in 1616 which I have before me lists

all and singular Woodes Underwoodes Trees Fruit trees, Hades Furrowes Meares Bankes Hedges Ditches Wayes Waters Water-courses Commons Profittes Easementes Emolumentes and Hereditamentes whatsoever.

These are what usually may be presumed to be found on a piece of land, and the language is always similar. In transfers of messuages in the city

we always have cellars, sollers, lights, easements, etc., and usually shops, chambers, garrets, yards, gardens, and watercourses. These are what usually go with such property. Cellars, sollers, lofts, chambers, garrets, rooms are all pretty much the same thing—rooms from basement to roof, and every house has them, and some or all of them are always enumerated. It all means: everything about this property which Gibbons owns is being leased to Hippy. The mention here of a wharf probably means at least that the tavern was on the waterfront and that there was some kind of a wharf or dock or landing place connected—or at least that the right to use such a wharf went with the property.

On the basis of this information readers may reach their own conclusions concerning my surmise that the Three Tonnes was "a relatively extensive establishment." Perhaps further investigation will provide us with not only the precise dimensions but also conclusive proof that this particular tavern was the one frequented by Jonson and his friends.

THOMAS A. KIRBY

*Louisiana State University*

---

## A PILGRIMAGE TO THE HOLY LAND

"The eight Booke of the First part of Purchas his Pilgrims" includes as its fifth chapter a Middle English travel poem of 1694 lines, of which the following are the first eight:

In the Name of the Fader that seteez in trone,  
And of Jhu his oonly blesset Sone,  
And of the Holy Gost, this blesset Trinete,  
And also of our Ladie S Marie  
And of all the Seintez of the Court of Heven,  
I make this mynde wit milde Steven:  
Wich waye I went I schall you telle,  
And how be the waie I dide dwelle

After this brief introduction, the poet gives an account of his journey to Jerusalem through Spain and Italy, then describes the Holy Land in some detail, and finally—after interpolating 48 lines of secondhand information about Egypt—tells of the journey back to England through Italy and Germany. The four-stress couplet pattern continues throughout. A cursory examination of the rimes



reveals such northernisms as *a* for OE. *ā* (p. 533,<sup>1</sup> l. 2.; etc.), *-ande* for the ending of the present participle (p. 529, l. 26, etc.), and *-s* for the ending of the third person singular present indicative (p. 535, l. 34; p. 570, l. 22).

There is no mention in Wells' *Manual* of any such pilgrimage as the one just described, nor have the compilers of *The Index of Middle English Verse* listed a poem beginning "In the Name of the Fader that seteez in trone." The poem's having been overlooked until now may mean that the printed version of 1625 is the only one that has survived.

A. R. DUNLAP

*University of Delaware*

---

### BASKET

On this word, which is attested about 1300 (W. de Bibbesworth), the *NED* writes:

*Basket* has been conjecturally identified with L. *bascauda*, used by Juvenal and Martial by the latter given as British. "Barbara de pictis veni bascauda Britannis. . ." But the senses anciently assigned to *bascauda* of 'washing-tub' or 'tray' do not favor this identification.

Skeat had said approximately the same: "... the oft-quoted Celtic-L. *bascauda* (Martial, Juvenal) gave rise to OF *bachoe*, *bachoue*, a basket (Godefroy, Cotgrave) which greatly differs in form." It was Weekley who comes the closest to a solution: he writes:

The *NED*'s objection that *bascauda* is described as a tub or brazen vessel and so could not be a basket is not serious, as the change of meaning could easily be paralleled. Moreover *bascauda* gave OF *bachoe*, a basket. In OF we also find *basche*, *basse* used in the same sense. It would appear that *basket* found in A[nglo]-F[rench] c. 1200 [sic], though not recorded in continental OF, must have been a dim. formation belonging to the same group.

Today, with the materials of the FEW at hand, we are in a position to support Weekley's assumption: von Wartburg lists s. v. *bascauda*, not only OF *bascho*[u]e 'vaisseau de bois ou d'osier,' and the regressive formation *bâche* 'grand panier d'osier,' but also

<sup>1</sup> Reference is to the 1905 reprint of *Hakluytus Posthumus: or Purchas His Pilgrimes* (James MacLehose and Sons, Glasgow), vol. VII.

dialectal derivatives with French suffixes: *bachole*, *bachot*. The latter type represents a masc. form *baschou* (derived from the fem. *baschoue*), which was adapted to the more common *-ot-* type. in Ht.-Maine, for example, we find *bâchot* 'hotte en osier.' If we should assume an Old-Normandian or Picardian form parallel to this *bâchot*, we would have a \**baskot* which, either directly or by change of suffix (*-ot* > *-et*), could give Eng. *basket*.

LEO SPITZER

### TICIUS TO TUSKAN, *GGK*, LINE 11

*Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, line 11 (MS. Cotton Nero Ax, folio 91a) reads:

Ticius to Tuskan & teldes bigȳnes.

The name Ticius as founder of Tuscany occurs nowhere else in history or legend. The only attempt to identify Ticius is that of Sir Frederick Madden (*Sir Gawayne*, p. 309) who suggests that "the name may possibly have been derived from Titus Tatius, king of the Sabines."

As an alternate suggestion, I propose to regard Ticius as a scribal error for Turnus, and to read the line:

Turnus to Tuskan & teldes bigȳnes.

The reading Ticius arises from the careless transcription of three letters: *ici* for *urn*. Comparison of the initial syllables of the noun *Ticnus* (folio 91a of the MS.) and the verb *turned* (folio 91a line 22, and folio 113a line 62) suggests how this error occurred. Omission of one of the two vertical strokes that form the *u* and the *n* convert those letters into *i*'s. A slight alteration in the cross stroke at the top of the *r* turns that letter into a *c* (or a *t* as it may also be read). These errors, occurring together, produce the false reading Ticius of the present manuscript.

The emended reading is supported by a passage in Higden's *Polychronicon*, Lib. II, Cap. xxvi,<sup>1</sup> where Turnus is named king of Tuscany:

Aeneas igitur Italiam veniens confoederatus est regi Evandro, qui in septem montibus tunc regnabat. Hi duo pugnaverunt contra Latinum,

<sup>1</sup> *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden*, Rolls Series, Vol. II (1869), p. 434.

regem Latinorum, et contra *Turnum, regem Tusciae*, generum scilicet regis Latini. In quo bello Pallas filius Evandri et Turnus occiduntur.

The proposed emendation has the merit of preserving the meter of the line in which it occurs, of improving the assonance, and of identifying the founder of Tuscany as a legendary figure like Aeneas, Romulus, Langeberde, and Brutus mentioned in the adjacent lines of *GGK*.

COOLIDGE OTIS CHAPMAN

*College of Puget Sound,  
Tacoma, Wash.*

### BEOWULF IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Old English scholars assure us that *Beowulf* was first published in 1815 by Thorkelm. Since the first English edition appeared in 1833, the epic was almost unknown during the eighteenth century. But Vaughan Wilkins hints that its vogue was of an earlier date. In his novel *Being Met Together* (1944) he represents the following conversation as having taken place in the year 1793 between Anthony Purvis, a twelve-year-old American boy, and Mr. Harradence, an English traveler. Harradence remarks (p. 82):

'Heroic! . . . That's how I like my poetry! Plenty of rhyme and plenty of facts. That's why the oldest poetry is the best—it doesn't forget that there is a story to tell. Did you ever read the poem of "Beowulf"?'

'That's the story of Grendel and his mother the Water-Hag. I've read bits of it.'

Conceivably, Harradence might have had access to Cotton Vitellius A xv, but it does seem a trifle unlikely that there was a hitherto unknown American edition—doubtless omitting such things as the Finnesburh episode—in which Master Purvis browsed!

H. W. STARR

*Temple University*

## AN ORDNANCE-MAP OF FEMININE CHARMS

The theme of the thirty or fewer points of beauty in a woman, a theme that Basil L. Gildersleeve wittily summed up in the title of this note, is the subject of recent comment by Professor Allan H. Gilbert.<sup>1</sup> He correctly suggests that we are here dealing with a literary convention and cites some interesting examples of its use. I have noted some very extensive collectanea dealing with this convention in my *Proverb*<sup>2</sup> and have since supplemented them in my *Problems in German Literary History of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*.<sup>3</sup> Donald F. Bond of the University of Chicago has kindly given me the exact reference to the passage in Johannes Nevizanus, *Sylva nuptialis* cited by Professor Gilbert.<sup>4</sup> The full history of this literary convention remains to be written.

ARCHER TAYLOR

*University of California,  
Berkeley*

---

 REVIEWS
 

---

*Vie d'Alexandre Hardy, poète du roi. Quarante-deux documents inédits.* Par S. WILMA DEIERKAUF-HOLSBOER. Philadelphia, 1947. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 91, no. 4, pp. 328-404 [about 60,000 words]. \$1.00.

Here is a book based, not on the author's conjectures, but on forty-two documents that she has discovered in the Archives Nationales, three of them already nibbled by rats, a fate that would have befallen others if she had not intervened. She has labored indefatigably to find, decipher, and interpret these papers, with the result that she has been able to rewrite the life of Corneille's principal predecessor in the history of modern French drama. She has also added materially to our knowledge of stage customs and of several important actors. She has unearthed what was probably the first school for actors in France.

<sup>1</sup> *MLN*, LXXII, 129-130.

<sup>2</sup> Cambridge, Mass., 1930. See pp. 103-104, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> New York, 1930. See p. 129, n. 11.

<sup>4</sup> Lyons, 1526, fo. lxxv<sup>m</sup>.

She shows that Hardy was himself an actor, that he probably began his career as a member of a troupe headed by a certain Adrien Talmy, that late in the sixteenth century he entered the company of Valleran le Conte, remained with it after his death and while it was directed by Bellerose until 1626, when, as a result of a quarrel over his manuscripts, he severed his connection with the leading French troupe and became the official playwright of Claude Deschamps, sieur de Villiers, subsequently known as Filpin. She finds that Hardy and Valleran were quite unsuccessful in their efforts to establish themselves at Paris between 1598 and the spring of 1612 and that they then left the city for the Low Countries; that the troupe was at Marseilles in 1620 and returned to the capital only in 1622, by which time tragedies, tragi-comedies, and pastorals had already come into favor there, so that Hardy must be considered less important than some of his contemporaries in establishing at Paris the newer type of drama.

One of the documents gives the titles of two plays by Hardy that have for three centuries been unknown, a comedy called *le Jaloux* and a play of uncertain genre called *Mellantre ou le Ravissement volontaire*. Others have enabled her to establish new dates for a number of his extant plays. The dating of their composition has always been a puzzle. The frères Parfaict's method of distributing them over the years of their author's activity was equitable, but absurd. Lanson and others made suggestions that have been of little help. I tried my hand at the problem twenty years ago without any approach to certainty. Mme Deierkauf-Holsboer has not reached a final conclusion in regard to all of the plays, but she has arrived at better dates for a dozen of them. The negotiations between Hardy and certain actors show that *la Mort de Daire*, *la Mort d'Alexandre*, and *Fregonde* were new plays in 1620, that *Aristoclée* and the *Triomphe d'Amour* were composed in 1626, that the plays first published in 1628 were written after September, 1626, and that before this last date were composed the ten lost plays whose titles and settings have been preserved by the *Mémoire de Mahelot*.

Among other findings are these: Valleran le Conte established at Paris in 1609 a school to which parents brought their children to be instructed in "la science de la comédie," or to "lire, escrire, jouer de l'épinette, . . . représenter sur le tæastre et en publicq toutes comedies, trage-comedies, pastoralles." Valleran did not use, as Rigal supposed, decorations possessed by the owners of the Hôtel de Bourgogne, but was obliged to have them made for the plays he produced. Hardy wrote comedies as well as plays belonging to other genres. After he sold his productions to the actors, he lost his right to publish them without their permission. When he made his contract with Deschamps, it was agreed that he should be paid for his work with a share in the receipts from performances, a method supposed by the frères Parfaict to have been introduced

many years later. Bellerose was a disciple of Valleran le Conte. Robert Guérin, better known as Gros-Guillaume, was already acting in 1598. Montdory joined Valleran's troupe in 1612, receiving half a share, as new actors often did fifty years later.

These facts and many others are combined with material previously discovered to present a new picture of Hardy and of theatrical conditions in the first third of the seventeenth century. I have only a few reservations to make in regard to the author's conclusions. They include questions that I discussed with her before her book was published.

She accepts literally statements made by Hardy and one of his critics about his age, but "trente ans" is too round a number to be interpreted in this fashion, as is indicated by a comparison with Corneille's varying remarks about the time when he composed *Mélite*. She assumes that when Hardy refers in 1628 to having known for thirty years the secrets of his art, he means that he became a hired poet in 1598, but, according to this hypothesis, Corneille and Racine, who were never hired, could never have claimed to know the secrets of their art. I am consequently not convinced that my dates for Hardy's birth and for the beginning of his career are any wider of the mark than hers. She thinks that *Mélantré ou le Ravisement volontaire* was probably the title of a comedy. My guess would be that it was a tragi-comedy. The fact that she has discovered that Hardy wrote comedies does not prove that he had won for the genre a place of honor or that Corneille was following his example in writing them, for comedies had been composed by others before Corneille, by Troterel, Mainfray, Ch . . . , and Rotrou.

These are minor matters. The book should be in the hands of all students of the French theater. Its publication by the American Philosophical Society gives new evidence of our interest in things French and of our desire to help our allies at a time when it is hard for them to publish a book of this character in so satisfactory a manner.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

"*La Wallonie*," 1886-1892. *The Symbolist Movement in Belgium*.

By ANDREW JACKSON MATHEWS. New York: King's Crown Press (Columbia University Press), 1947. Pp. viii + 115. \$2.25.

*Literary Origins of Surrealism. A New Mysticism in French Poetry*. By ANNA BALAKIAN. New York: King's Crown Press (Columbia University Press), 1947. Pp. ix + 159. \$2.75.

These two works are attractive examples of bookmaking along somewhat novel lines of smaller format and appearance approximating that of the popular commercial press, including "blurbs"

before the latter's death in 1945. These interviews have obviously left their stamp on the entire study, and give to it a certain air of *choses vécues* and intimate information which adds greatly to its documentary value.

*La Wallonie* itself, founded in 1886 by Mockel as a successor to *L'Élan littéraire*, appears to have gone through three distinct phases of development: first, an intellectual college boys' *fumisterie*, next, a regionalist review exalting the glory of the Wallon provinces and their literary traditions (an outgrowth of this phase was the adoption of the old term "Wallonie" as a place-name by the French provinces of Belgium), and lastly, a mature periodical with strong leanings towards Symbolism, a vehicle for the publication of poems by Mallarmé, Valéry, Stuart Merrill, Régner, Vielé-Griffin, and even André Gide. Most of these contributions came late in the career of *La Wallonie*, the editors of which, sensing the growing difficulties of keeping its nucleus of writers and contributors together, announced cessation of publication a whole year in advance, "un fait unique," in the words of Mockel, "dans l'histoire des petites revues."

His research in the files of *La Wallonie* has enabled Mathews to bring to light a number of *médits* and *curiosa*. Reprinted for the first time since their original appearance in *La Wallonie* are a prose poem by Verhaeren, two poems of Merrill, two poems by Henri de Régner, two by Vielé-Griffin, one by André Gide, and one by Valéry. Other items of interest include a prose poem by Van Lerberghe (once accused of plagiarizing Maeterlinck, but later proved to be the precursor, not the follower), a letter from Mallarmé, and the description of a project by Pierre Olm for "un roman en trois parties, dont le dernier verbe du dernier volume aurait comme sujet le premier mot du premier volume" which seems a surprising anticipation of *Finnegans Wake*.

The last important chapter of Mathews' book, "The Making of a Critic," is devoted entirely to Mockel and his theories. By far the least interesting part of the work, it nevertheless provides a careful summing-up, for what they are worth, of the esthetic ideas of a man gifted with a lively sense of the contemporary and a keen appreciation of literary excellence. A brief concluding chapter, "In Short," lists the outstanding contributions of *La Wallonie* to the literary renaissance in Belgium, which included, in addition to the items mentioned above, the publication of the "first Symbolist play," Van Lerberghe's *Les Fleurs*, as well as the second and more famous one, Maeterlinck's *L'Intruse* (1890).

A certain parallelism may be discerned between Mr. Mathews' approach to his subject through the personality of Mockel and Mrs. Anna Balakian's approach to the problems of the *Literary Origins of Surrealism* through personal contact with the chief prophet of

the movement, André Breton. Balakian, however, seems less persuaded as to Breton's views and theories, and in fact in one place (p. 39) neatly demonstrates that Breton's establishment of Achim von Arnim as an ideological precursor for surrealism is based at least in part on Gautier's mistranslation of Arnim: for example, "Je discerne avec peine ce que je vois avec les yeux de la réalité de ce que voit mon imagination," for "Ich kann *genau* unterscheiden was ich mit dem Auge der Wahrheit sehen muss oder was ich mir gestalte," a totally different and unsurrealistic doctrine, and one which Balakian successfully demonstrates to be the basis of such of Arnim's stories as *Die Majorats-Herren*, a favorite among the surrealists.

Balakian's study begins with a chapter on "Surreality" designed to define and illustrate the movement as manifested in the works of Breton, Éluard, Aragon, Crevel, Tzara (Dadaists and surrealists are more or less the same, according to Balakian's conception), and others. Charcot and his studies of hysteria are mentioned, but, strangely enough, there is not one word about Freud, whose theory of dream analysis (Breton began as a practicing psychiatrist) has an obvious and long-recognized *rapport* with the subject. Next a chapter on "The Romantic Background" discusses the romanticists' occultism, finding therein a sort of escape into the invisible, the unreal, and the supernatural, but one which cannot be set up as a base for the theories of surrealism, since "every phenomenon that overflows into fantasy has its reverse side dipped into nature" (p. 37). An interesting passage on Nerval demonstrates how, in the midst of disordered visions, the writer sought to preserve the forms of logic and reality (in contrast, say, to Rimbaud's exploitation of his *dérèglement des sens*), and an illuminating citation from Georges Dumas' *États intellectuels dans la mélancholie* shows a similar conformist preoccupation among the insane, whose visions are thus diametrically opposed to those of the true surrealists.

Baudelaire is, to Balakian, the poet whose visions first approximated "surreality," and in a long chapter on him, replete with citations from his prose works as well as his poetry, the author retraces his esthetic theories. Most of the citations are familiar to students of the subject, and most of the observations have been made before, but Balakian succeeds in arranging her material interestingly.<sup>1</sup>

Balakian's treatment of Rimbaud develops further the idea (first expressed perhaps by the critic who suggested a child's alphabet book as the source of the sonnet *Voyelles*) that Rimbaud imposed on adult "reality" the child's mystical acceptance of the

<sup>1</sup> Here, as in later pages on Rimbaud and Lautréamont, I had the impression that a fuller picture was needed, and turning to see what I had done myself with the material in my *Aspects fondamentaux de l'esthétique symboliste*, 1933, I found most of the citations and many more. There is, of course, no harm in doing things over again!



absurd and illogical. She cites a nonsense rime from Eugène Rolland's *Rimes et jeux de l'enfance* ("J'ai vu une vache / Danser sur la glace," etc.) which indeed suggests the mood of many of Rimbaud's "visions." Her suggestion that Rimbaud's use of the word *voyant* may be taken from Gautier's definition ("on appelle ainsi l'adepte sobre") of its application among hashish eaters is also provocative. In dealing with Lautréamont, however, Balakian passes over in silence the whole moral significance of his epic *Chants de Maldoror*, a complicated problem dealt with at length by Pierre-Quint in *Le Comte de Lautréamont et Dieu*, a work absent from Balakian's bibliography. Lautréamont is depicted as "mutilating himself in order to break with human nature and seek the unknown," producing a series of "forced aberrations." A view of Mallarmé is then presented which is based almost entirely on one work, the posthumous *Ignitur* (first published in 1925), which, interesting though it is, will hardly serve to explain the intricate relationship of Mallarmé's poetry and theories to contemporary literature.

Two final chapters are entitled "The Road to the Absolute" and "The Road to Chaos." Balakian cites from poets of various periods and schools lines having to do with a voyage, especially a voyage into the unknown, or one immobilized, or shipwrecked (Gide, Jarry, Apollinaire, Supervielle, Rimbaud's *Bateau wre*, Mallarmé's *Un Coup de dés*, etc.). These are offered as symbolic of the poets' escape into surreality through "dehumanization," "the marriage of the concrete and the abstract," and "the cult of the future." A page of typical contradictory images from Apollinaire consists of listings similar to those used effectively by the Museum of Modern Art in its table of devices and media employed by the surrealist painters (*Fantastic Art, Dada, Surrealism*, New York, 1936, p. 65). No reference appears, however, to the well-known passage in the *Chants de Maldoror* dealing with this type of imagery.

"The Road to Chaos" deals mainly with Dada, and raises the question whether Balakian's chapter on "Surreality" might not better have been worked in here at the end. The author sees surrealism, in the long view, mainly as "an old poetic theme," namely, "the human desire to escape physical limitations," which has become "crystallized in a mysticism that tends to endow art with an existence independent of nature and human life" (p. 145).

Mrs. Balakian's book is an interesting contribution to the study of surrealism in its literary aspects. Many thorough and penetrating studies of the movement from the standpoint of surrealist painting have tended to obscure its literary origins. Critics like Herbert Read and Georges Hugnet (though he is himself a surrealist poet) give the impression that the movement is dominated by such figures as Max Ernst, Tanguy, Dalí, Man Ray, Duchamp, Magritte, and Miró; Mrs. Balakian, that it is dominated by Éluard, Aragon, and Breton. "Origins," "precursors," and "influences" may be

found in quantity, in both the field of the arts and of literature. Will a new type of critic-scholar produce a much-needed synthesis of both aspects?

BRUCE A. MORRISSETTE

*Washington University*

*Milton's "Paradise Lost": A Commentary on the Argument.* By JOHN S. DIEKHOFF. New York: Columbia University Press, 1946. Pp. iv + 161. \$2.00.

Professor Diekhoff's study of *Paradise Lost* is quite literally what the title implies—a "commentary on the argument," and on that alone. Except for some introductory material explaining Milton's debt to Renaissance theories of poetry, the writer makes very little effort to discuss the work as literature or to place it in its historical setting. Instead, he confines himself almost entirely to a careful analysis of the subject-matter as it stands, with but one question in mind. does Milton prove his case? In other words, granted his premises, does he use arguments which are consistent, sound, and reasonable? Professor Diekhoff thinks that he does.

Much of the ground the book covers can hardly be called unexplored territory. That Satan may justly be called evil because he falls out of pride, admits his own guilt, and undergoes progressive deterioration of character; that Adam and Eve are justly punished because, though fully warned and equipped to resist temptation, they succumb, the one to deceit and the other to excessive love; that God acts justly throughout because he has by right of creation and merit claim to the absolute allegiance of all being, knows that the gift of free will which makes the Fall possible forms the only possible condition of virtue, and through mercy and power brings good out of evil—all these and many other observations will not seem new to anyone who has taken a good course on Milton or read *Paradise Lost* with a modicum of attention. These familiar arguments are, however, handled with a terseness, lucidity, and precision that make this new summary valuable, while the care with which Professor Diekhoff conducts his examination frequently results in the discovery of points neglected by former critics: why Milton felt that fallen angels should suffer more heavily than fallen men, for instance, or his reasons for condemning in *Paradise Lost* the free search for knowledge he had advocated in *Areopagitica*. By this concentration on the epic as argument rather than as poetry, Professor Diekhoff successfully avoids one scholarly pitfall: the danger of confusing the matter with the means, and dismissing as weak or fallacious reasoning what is frequently only a failure to give a subject adequate literary expression. He has, too, the great advantage of respecting his material. His sympathy with the

Miltonic point-of-view (the book concludes with a direct plea for the validity of the poet's ethical if not his theological system) makes it easy for him to discuss the arguments of *Paradise Lost* on their own terms; he is not, like the romantic critics and their successors, perpetually tempted to carp at the tenets he is obliged to analyse, or explain them away by assuming that Milton could not really have meant what he said.

One wishes, however, that Professor Diekhoff had not confined himself to quite so limited a field of research. In the last analysis, *Paradise Lost* must stand or fall not upon the logical purity of its argument, but upon the degree to which Milton successfully transmutes that argument into poetry, and the extent to which his readers are prepared sympathetically to comprehend it. It would perhaps be unfair to demand that Professor Diekhoff give more consideration to the fact that Milton's Satan is an artistic triumph, his God an artistic failure; but one cannot help wondering why he did not support his case for the defence by explaining what lies behind the poet's assumptions as well as the assumptions themselves. It is all very well to point out, as he does, that the modern unbeliever must simply accept the agents in Milton's story as he accepts the gods and heroes of Homer; but at least he sees the latter as Homer meant him to see them, whereas he approaches Adam, Eve, Satan, the Son, and the Father with a mind full of presuppositions about their character, frequently very different from those held by Milton and his audience. While he may, in justice, grant Milton's premises, he would certainly be more likely to understand and sympathize with them if he knew more clearly what they were. For example, Professor Diekhoff defends Milton against the charge that he makes life in Eden vacuous by asserting that since he explicitly states that those "charming pastoral figures" Adam and Eve were happy there, we must of necessity take his word for it. But would it not be easier for us to do so if we realized that in the eyes of the seventeenth century Adam and Eve were not the charming pastoral figures or happy savages that modern tradition makes of them, but, as C. S. Lewis has pointed out, a great lord and lady, highly dignified, accomplished, and intelligent? Nor would the inclusion of more such historical material merely serve to illuminate Milton's argument. It would give the whole commentary a wider appeal than it can now possess. As a brief, clear, and complete account of what Milton actually says, it is, within its limits, excellent. But it offers little that a well-trained student of Milton would not know already from his own consideration of the poem. The readers who would find it most valuable will probably be either undergraduates anxious for a concise summary of the arguments themselves, or individuals tackling the epic for the first time without a guide.

ELIZABETH MARIE POPE

Mills College

*Four Plays by Holberg* translated from the Danish by HENRY ALEXANDER with an Introduction by OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL, JR., Princeton University Press for the American-Scandinavian Foundation. 1946. Pp. x + 202. \$2.50.

The four Holberg plays which—with the titles: *The Fussy Man*, *The Masked Ladies*, *The Weathercock*, *Masquerades*,—have recently become accessible to English readers belong to the Danish-Norwegian author's first and great period of comedy-writing. The general characteristics of Holberg's plays are evident in these four, though none of them quite reaches the bold character-portrayal in *Jeppe of the Hill* or the Socratic wisdom in *Erasmus Montanus*.

The translator of Holberg faces a very difficult task. Various archaisms in the original—such words as *ikkun*, *tilforn*—are more pronounced than is evident in the translation. Many still current, intrinsically Danish phrases—as *Børnhille*—defy translation. The strong local color—such allusions as to Pebling Lake—naturally fade completely. The apparent crazy-quilt pattern of foreign languages within the original presents, however, a far more unusual and complicated problem for the translator. Holberg's amused fun-poking and his realistic technique shine through in the Danish version. The specific foreign language that the character inserts indicates to considerable extent his place—or would-be place in society. The elegant world, still reflecting the rays of *le roi soleil*, weaves in as much French as is possible: French phrases or French words, either straight or given a Danish inflection (e. g. *faveur*, *qualité*, *estime*, *manquerer*, *at dvertere sig*). This précieux effect is, however, lessened appreciably in translation since a great number of the same words centuries ago became thoroughly assimilated in English. Latin words and quotations indicating the erudite pedant, give obviously the same impression in English. They are however, used more freely and mockingly in the Danish text (cf. "denne hans prima kaere Datter, secunda ikke" with "his first and dearest daughter, not his second" *The Fussy Man*, I, 9). German in Holberg generally connotes lower class e. g.: Jeppe the peasant lapses while drunk into broken German, learned in the militia. The Jewish usurer in *Den ellefte Juni* speaks half German, half Danish. German trades-people and practitioners as the barber in *The Fussy Man* sometimes speak straight German. Many German words had, however, also filtered down from above, from the court, from German queens, the genteel effect of these words having in Holberg's day become somewhat tarnished. It is obviously quite impossible for any translator to render the impression suggested by such a clumsily incorporated word as *indgetogen* (*eingezogen*), "retired," "refined."

But why not keep, in *The Fussy Man*, the name "Vielgeschrei,"

instead of translating it as "Mr. Fussy"? In this name of the main character the author was undoubtedly ridiculing a certain type of German pedantry, expressed here in Vielgeschrei's book-keeping. Why not, in the same play take over the German barber's German instead of translating it? Holberg heartily disliked German but used it here for specific purposes. Why not retain the German part of Henrich's amusing attempt to represent a German rabbi? Henrich's sovereign ignoring of all troublesome grammatical word-endings adds variation to the burlesque element. Holberg's ironical intentions with a great part of the foreign words and passages stand out clearly when one remembers his early struggles to free his own Danish from dross after leaving the German school in his native Bergen (*cf.* appendix to his *Metamorphosis*). In his application for a professorship at the University of Copenhagen he also expressly states that one of his chief aims in life is to continue to improve the Danish language. Jeppe's irritated outburst against the lawyers arguing in Latin: "Talk Danish, you black hound" (*Jeppe* IV, 6) comes from Holberg's own heart.

The translator may have turned these German passages into English in order to avoid eventual unfortunate misunderstandings from a political angle. But is this necessary? And is it necessary to expurgate Holberg from a moral point of view? Even ever so slightly? *Cf. e. g.* "Let me put my arm around your waist," with "Lad mig fôle dine Bryster." (*Masked Ladies* I, 4 against *De Usynlige* I, 4 Jubeludgave). Did not Holberg intend such coarseness indulged in by Harlequin as a realistic touch to set this character off against Leander? Did he not wish above all to accent the burlesque effect of crude vulgarity aping over-refinement and exposing itself constantly? In the preface to his *Epistles* (written some 20 years after the first comedies) Holberg actually protests against the efforts of "paene Folk" (nice people) to exclude "free and natural expressions" from his comedies, while adding that he hates vulgar language. Coarse burlesque as well as grammatical burlesque are merely two of the many notes Holberg sounds—and sounds often—in his wide-spanning satire.

But on the whole we have before us an excellent translation—all of the meat, if not quite all of the piquant sauce of the original. The *American-Scandinavian Foundation* has now given us two volumes of Holberg. Perhaps we may hope for a third.

CAROL K. BANG

Baltimore, Md

*Fabulous Voyager. James Joyce's Ulysses.* By RICHARD M. KAIN.  
Chicago University Press, 1947. Pp. 299. \$4.00.

For the scholar or layman who is making his first excursion through *Ulysses*, Mr. Kain's study is the best available guidebook. The careful appendices of verbal motifs, facts about the characters, the topography of Dublin, etc., are in themselves worth the somewhat high price of the book. Mr. Kain has in general eschewed Joyce's symbolic "abstrusities" and concentrated on the narrative and tonal structure; the social criticism, stressing Joyce's understanding of the moral plight of modern times, the larger philosophical scaffolding of the book, its tendency to hypostatize social and moral questions into metaphysics; and the character of the central figure, Leopold Bloom. That is to say, Mr. Kain has chosen several ways (though not the only ways) of showing that *Ulysses*, like any good novel, is a meaningful totality, not a chaos of irresponsible wordplay or a piece of intellectual nihilism.

*Fabulous Voyager* does not supersede Stuart Gilbert's pioneer work; it is, rather, a welcome complement to it. As Mr. Kain says, Gilbert made too much of the Homeric parallel. one cannot really grasp the structure and direction of Joyce's book by comparing it with the *Odyssey*. And Gilbert overstressed those few mythological themes which he himself appeared to be interested in. Yet the truth is that much remains to be done with the myth and symbolism of *Ulysses* which neither Mr. Kain, Gilbert, nor Mr. Harry Levin has been able to do (Mr. Kain is wrong in saying that "most of the symbolic details" are "artifice" and not "art").

But even within the scope of the intention of *Fabulous Voyager*, one must object to the treatment of Stephen Daedalus. Surely a large part of Joyce's "social insight" is concentrated on that very difficult cultural problem the modern artist and society. Mr. Kain realizes this. But he only dips his toe into the troubled waters, and the upshot of p. 97 is an apparently simple but really very confusing formula: Stephen is a self-pitying cynic; so is the modern artist; Stephen is Joyce's (?), Mr. Kain's (?) warning against ivory towerists who shun "social action." We have to question Joyce's right to descant on the plight of the artist: his insight in this matter is often thin and niggardly and dogmatically epigrammatic.

For longtime admirers and students of Joyce, *Fabulous Voyager* will be an indispensable reference work; but they will be already convinced of Mr. Kain's central arguments.

RICHARD CHASE

Connecticut College,  
New London, Conn

# Modern Language Notes

---

---

Volume LXIII

FEBRUARY, 1948

Number 2

---

---

## POETRY PRESERVED IN MUSIC

### *Bibliographical Notes on Smollett and Oswald, Handel, and Haydn*

With regard to the *Magic Flute* it was said that Emanuel Schikaneder, its author, was preserved in Mozart's music like a gnat in amber. The libretto, however, was printed long before the score, even before the first fragments of a vocal score were published. There are other cases of literature preserved in music, where the poet was larger than a gnat and the music less precious than amber, e. g. Goethe's first lyrics in Bernhard Theodor Breitkopf's song collection (Leipzig 1770). The publication of a poem, or a play, with music may well be its first, or even its only appearance in print. Since the study of words in music lies in the 'no-man's-land' between the realms of music and literature, more often than not, they are overlooked by the scholars of both arts.

To show how this happens, two examples, both relating to Tobias Smollett, are given below.

## I

### *Smollett's first printed Poem*

Lewis M. Knapp, now of Colorado College, Colorado Springs, has dealt with "Smollett's Verses and their Musical Settings in the Eighteenth Century" in *MLN.*, April 1931. He neglects the lyrics of the lost tragedy *Alceste* preserved in Handel's music, also printed in the 18th century, as shown in the second note of this paper; but he deals very thoroughly with the single poems. Knapp lists the following eight Smollett songs:

*The Tears of Scotland*, set by James Oswald and published on 3rd December 1746, as an appendix to a collection of six songs 'in the true Scots

Taste,' called *The Land of Cakes, Book the First*, printed for R. Williams and sold by J. Oswald, J. Newbery and W. Owen, engraved and/or ornamented by T. Kitchin (no copy known),<sup>1</sup> also set by Allan Masterton for G. Thomson's *Select Collection of Original Scottish Airs*, 4th Set (Edinburgh 1799).

*When Sappho Tun'd the Raptur'd Strain*, a different version of a poem in *Roderick Random*, set by Philip Hayes and published in 1795, printed by Thomas Skillern for the Author.<sup>2</sup>

*Thy fatal shafts unerring move*, another poem from *Roderick Random*, set by Oswald and published in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, July 1755, also set by Hayes and published about 1790 as s. sh. fol.<sup>3</sup>

*Where now are all my flatt'ring dreams of Joy* (called *Love Elegy*), again from *Roderick Random*, set by John Buswell and published about 1750 as s. sh. fol.

*Adieu, ye Streams that smoothly flow*, from *Peregrine Pickle*, set by Oswald and published three times as s. sh. fol. about 1745 and 1750; also set by Filippo Palma and published about 1750 as s. sh. fol.

*The Tars of Old England* from the play *The Reprisal*, probably set by Oswald and published in 1757 as s. sh. fol.

*Let the nymph still avoid*, also from *The Reprisal*, probably set by Oswald and published in 1757 as s. sh. fol.

*From the Man whom I love*, again from *The Reprisal*, set by Oswald and published in 1757 as s. sh. fol.<sup>4</sup>

This list already shows Oswald as the main composer of Smollett's poems. But Knapp missed Oswald's earliest Smollett song, and with it the first print of any poem by Smollett, in fact, his first publication. The song is another setting of the poem *When Sappho tun'd . . .* in the version mentioned above. Philip Hayes, Professor of Music at Oxford, found the other version apparently in Oswald's earlier setting. Oswald's setting was published in one of the numerous, but now rare, song collections of the 18th century. On the title-page of this collection we find two other names, already mentioned in connection with *The Tears of Scotland*: the names of the engraver and of the publisher.

In 1743, Thomas Kitchin, an English engraver, started to issue a collection of single sheet songs in Quarto which he probably sold

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted as s. sh. fol. about 1750, and in Oswald's *Caledonian Pocket Companion*, Book IV, about 1752: two slightly different versions.

<sup>2</sup> For two other settings of this poem, with numerous reprints, see below.

<sup>3</sup> Reprinted in the *Literary Magazine*, Oct.-Nov. 1757. For later reprints, with a different music, see below.

<sup>4</sup> A reprint, which Knapp did not mention, appeared, with a vignette, in the collection *Olio and Euterpe* (I, 94), published by Henry Roberts in 1768.



singly and which he possibly intended to publish in book form under the title *The English Orpheus*. The book, however, was never published. Eventually, John Newbery took over the plates, erased the title from the top and the publisher's name from the bottom of the plates, augmented their number from about 80 to 126, and published them as *Universal Harmony*, consisting of "English and Scots Songs," in 1745, issuing a second edition in 1746. Kitchin's name, as the engraver, was given on the title-page.

At the end of the book there are to be found some songs by Oswald, the earliest of which, on page 86, is entitled "A New Song, Set by Mr. Oswald, the Words by Mr. Smollett," and is ornamented with a vignette by Kitchin. The poem which Oswald set to music is the first version of that poem which Smollett inserted in chapter XL of his autobiographical novel *Roderick Random* (1748). There he introduced the shortened and altered version of the poem with the following words: "I owned that, while I was at college, I wrote some detached pieces, at the desire of a friend who was in love; and at her [my lady's] request repeated the following verses, which indeed my love for Narcissa had inspired." Now, the pretended fiction seems to have been the truth. The poem, as it is commonly known, begins 'When Sappho struck the quiv'ring wire' and consists of three stanzas only, entitled 'On Celia, Playing on the Harpsichord, and Singing'; later it was also printed separately as 'Verses on a young Lady playing on a Harpsichord and singing.' The original version however, consisted of the following four stanzas:

#### A NEW SONG

Set by Mr. Oswald, the Words by Mr. Smollett

##### 1

When Sappho tun'd the raptur'd strain,  
The list'ning wretch forgot his pain,  
With Art divine the lyre she strung,  
Like thee she play'd, like thee she sung,  
Like thee she play'd, like thee she sung.

##### 2

For while she struck the quiv'ring wire,  
The eager breast was all on fire;  
And when she joyn'd the vocal lay,  
The captive soul was charm'd away.  
The captive etc.

## 3

But had she added still to these,  
 Thy softer chaster pow'r to please,  
 Thy beauteous air of sprightly youth,  
 Thy native smiles of artless truth.  
 Thy native etc.

## 4

She ne'er had pin'd beneath disdain,  
 She ne'er had play'd and sung in vain,  
 Despair her soul had ne'er possess'd  
 To dash on rocks the tender breast.  
 To dash etc.

When we consider that Smollett was absent from England between the autumn of 1740 and the spring of 1744, that plate 86 of *Universal Harmony* was apparently an additional one provided for the publication in book form by Newbery, who advertised the proposals for publishing it on 17 January, 1745, we may assume that Smollett wrote the poem and Oswald set it to music in 1744. In any case, it was written several years before the publication of the novel into which the standard version of the poem was inserted.<sup>5</sup> Knapp's doubts about the authenticity of Hayes' version and about the temporary order of the two versions are solved by the re-discovery of Oswald's setting.

One word more about the composer. \* Shortly after Smollett went to London (1739), Oswald, another Scot, followed his example (1741). Formerly a dancing-master at Dunfermline, he later earned his living as a fiddler in Edinburgh between 1736 and 1740. Eventually he became a well-known composer and for some time was also a music-publisher in London, but not much is known of his life there between 1741 and 1747. Knapp has already stressed the fact that 'Smollett's debt to Oswald was a considerable one accumulating as it did from 1746 to 1757,' or rather from 1744 onwards. In, or about, 1747 Smollett mentioned Oswald in a letter to Dr. Alexander Carlyle:<sup>6</sup> 'Oswald the musician, who promised from time to time to set your songs to music . . . has set it [the

<sup>5</sup> The song itself was reprinted in 1754, with the names of the poet and the composer, in the collection *The Muses' Delight*, published by John Sadler in Liverpool (pp. 205 sq.).

<sup>6</sup> E. S. Noyes, *The Letters of Tobias Smollett*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1926, pp. 6 sq. (Cf also pp 117 sq.).

*Lamentations of Fanny Gardner*] to an excellent tune, in the Scotch style . . . not yet published.' It is a pity that Smollett's letters tell nothing of his own relations with Oswald; but, as Knapp suggests, Smollett may have frequented Oswald's *Society of the Temple of Apollo*, 'composed chiefly of Scots,' about 1745.

Like *The Tears of Scotland*, the Sappho poem was reprinted in Thomson's *Collection of Scottish Airs*. This time, in volume three of 1802, Smollett's poem is adapted, as one of two alterations, to the air *Bonny John* (no. 31). The air, with Allan Ramsay's words *Love's goddess in a myrtle grove*, was arranged, with Pianoforte Trio accompaniment, by Haydn, as were all the songs in volume three. Haydn, however, was probably unaware of the existence of Smollett's poem until the publication of this volume. There the poem is printed, together with Ramsay's words, on a letter-press page, opposite the engraved music which shows the first of Ramsay's stanzas only. In this form Smollett's poem was re-printed several times, in later editions of the volume, between 1804 and 1838.<sup>7</sup>

Yet another of Smollett's poems appeared in this volume of Thomson's folio collection: *Thy fatal shafts unerring move*, as an alternative to the air *An thou wert mine an thing* (no. 20). It was reprinted twice as no. 28 of volume five in Thomson's octavo collections, first in 1822, and again in 1825, later issues of which appeared in 1828 and 1831. In addition it appeared in the third volume of later editions of the folio collection.

It is noteworthy that Smollett's Sappho-Clelia poem, in its first version, has been printed with music about ten times between 1745 and 1838, but was not discovered by the Smollett scholars until 1931, and then in its less remarkable musical setting.

## II

### *The Lyrics of Smollett's 'Alceste'*

"That Scot is a damned fool! I should have made his work immortal." These are the words Handel is said to have used when all the preparations for the performance of the tragedy *Alceste* came to nothing. John Rich, the manager of Covent Garden, ordered the play from Smollett in 1748, the music (on account of a debt)

<sup>7</sup> Cf. C. Hopkinson and C. B. Oldman, *Thomson's Collection of National Songs*, *Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions*, Vol. II., Part 1, 1940.

from Handel in 1749, and the decorations—probably the most expensive part—from Servandoni, the famous architect, who, a year earlier, had provided the fireworks for Handel's well-known music; the singers were already chosen—in short, everything was nearly ready for production at the beginning of 1750. Then something went wrong, what we do not know. It is said that Rich found the play too bad, or the music too good for his theatre. Smollett, in his recently published letter of 14th February 1749, expressed the hope that his tragedy—then already written—would be acted next season 'without fail' and appear 'with such magnificence of scenery as was never exhibited in Britain before.'<sup>8</sup> And yet, if Handel really made that remark, or a similar one, then it was Smollett himself who frustrated the production. Probably, we shall never know the truth of the matter. The loss of Smollett's manuscript does not prove anything. Is it not related that he had written, beside *The Regicide* (1749) and *The Reprisal* (1757), another play, *The Absent Man*, and that in 1752 he offered the manuscript of this comedy, including "half the Copyright and Profits in the Acting," to anybody interested and confident? The comedy is lost without trace. The tragedy too was thought, by all the Smollett scholars, to be a complete loss. It is, however, partly preserved in the lyrics set by Handel between 27 December, 1749 and 8 January, 1750. This case may be compared with *Rosamunde*, a very famous title of an unknown play by Helmina von Chézy, the authoress of the libretto to Weber's *Euryanthe*. Her play is also lost, but the few lyrics are preserved with Schubert's music. There is, however, a difference between the cases of *Alceste* and *Rosamunde*: the latter was performed, if only twice, and half a dozen reviews tell us the poor story of its plot. Nothing is known about the plot of *Alceste*, and it seems doubtful if anybody would dare to reconstruct its story for a concert or a stage performance of Handel's music, with Overture, Entr'acts, Ballets and Songs, as was done in Vienna and in New Haven with the music of *Rosamunde* in 1928.

We are, therefore, unable to save the whole of the work. Handel, for his part, was economical enough to save the greater part of his music by using it for about one half of *The Choice of Hercules*<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> *TLS*, 24 July 1943, p. 360 (Henry W. Meikle).

<sup>9</sup> A Musical Interlude, the words of which were founded, by William Duncombe, on a poem by Robert Lowth.

in the summer of 1750. He transplanted one song of *Alceste* with Smollett's verses to *The Chorce of Hercules* (no copyright reserved'), two others to the oratio *Alexander Balus* (words by Thomas Morell), and one to the cantata *Hercules* (words by Thomas Broughton) at their revivals in 1751 and 1752 respectively. Furthermore, George Colman the Elder, Rich's successor at Covent Garden in 1767, according to Samuel Arnold, used 'two of the most capital scenes' by Servandoni. *The Court of Pluto*, very fittingly, in Lewis Theobald's *Rape of Proserpine* (music by Galliard, revived in 1769) and *The Drawing Room of Venus*<sup>10</sup> in Kane O'Hara's *The Golden Pippin* (pasticcio, with music by Handel and many other composers, produced in 1773). The colours of the first scene, it is related, 'must have suffered by the length of time.'

We are, however, able to add the lyrics, or most of the lyrics, of the lost tragedy to Smollett's collected works, in which, curiously enough, they have never been included. The only song thought to have come from the tragedy is one that H. S. Buck saw in Smollett's *Ode to Sleep*, published simultaneously in the *British Magazine* and the *Scots Magazine* for June 1760, but this does not appear to belong to *Alceste* at all. Smollett published that song with the note, 'Intended as a chorus in a tragedy,' and no other tragedy of his is known to be lost. Nevertheless, it seems improbable that the chorus *Ode to Sleep* was a first or even a later version of Calliope's air *Gentle Morpheus* which Handel set to music.

Handel's music is preserved in autograph (King's Music Library and British Museum) and at least in one copy by his amanuensis Smith.<sup>11</sup> It was published by S. Arnold in about 1792 (in volume 23 of Handel's collected works, serial numbers 84 and 85) and reprinted, in a revised edition, by F. Chrysander in 1887 (as volume 46B of Handel's complete works). Arnold entitled it wrongly *Alcides, an English Opera*, and Chrysander used the title *Musical Scenes to an English Play called Alceste*.<sup>12</sup> The Smollett scholars

<sup>10</sup> It seems improbable that Venus should have appeared in an *Alceste* play

<sup>11</sup> Arnold tells us that Colman gave him the Covent Garden score; Chrysander calls Smith's copy the conductor's score. Therefore, it seems that both used the same copy—Handel's final version.

<sup>12</sup> After the first (and only?) production of the music, by the Handel Society in London, on 29 May, 1889, Novello, Ewer & Co. published a vocal score of *Alceste* in 1890.

overlooked the publication of the lyrics, and the Handel scholars were not aware of their omission. Therefore, the lyrics preserved in music, are reprinted here, for the first time, as poetry.

It is, perhaps, useful to remember that the Greek legend of *Alkestis* tells of Admetus, King of Thessaly, who was condemned to die by Artemis' fury, but saved by the self-sacrifice of his wife, Alceste, whom Hercules delivered from Hades. This legend became famous through Euripides' play; from Lully to Boughton and Wellesz numerous operas have been based on the legend or the play. Handel himself used the story as early as 1727 when he set an altered version of Aureli's *L'Antigona delusa da Alceste*, under the title *Admeto*. Some of the most popular singers were included in the cast. Senesino as Admeto, Boschi as Ercole, Faustina as Alceste, and Cuzzoni as her counterpart, Antigona. Now, in 1750, Handel gave the part of Apollo and some other Tenor-parts to Mr. Lowe, the Bass-part of Charon to Mr. Waltz, his former cook, the Soprano-part of Calliope (the Muse of Epic) to Mrs. Arne, the Soprano-part of the Syren and—strangely enough—an Alto-part to her niece, Miss Young, another Soprano-part to Miss Faulkner. Whether Admetus and Alceste were singing-parts or not, we do not know. In addition, the cast seems to have included Pluto, Hercules (called Alcides), Thetis, perhaps her brother Lykomedes,<sup>13</sup> and the other Muses.

*Overture*

*ACT I*

*Grand Entrée*

*Recitativo-Tenor*

Ye happy people, with loud accents speak  
Your grateful joy in Hymenean verse,  
Admetus and Alceste claim the song.

*Soli and Chorus*

Triumph, Hymen, in the pair;  
Thus united,  
Thus delighted,  
Brave the one, the other fair<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> It may be that Smollett's play was influenced by Quinault's libretto for Lully (1674).

<sup>14</sup> Words and music of the recitativo and the chorus were used again by Handel in the oratorio *Alexander Balus* (1751) with the alterations *Balus*

*Solo and Chorus*

Still caressing and caress'd,  
 Ever blessing, ever blest,  
     Live the royal happy pair.  
 This is, valour, thy reward,  
 This, o beauty, the regard,  
     Kind Heav'n pays the virtuous fair.<sup>15</sup>

*Aria-Tenor*

Ye swift minutes as ye fly,  
 Crown them with harmonious joy!  
     Let soft quiet, peace and love  
     Still each happier hour improve  
     While as day each day succeeds,  
     Lovely and heroic deeds  
     In fair virtue's path alone  
     Add a lustre to the throne.  
 Ye swift minutes as ye fly,  
 Crown them with harmonious joy!

*Chorus*

O bless, ye powers above,  
     The bridegroom and the bride,  
     Whose willing hands  
     Hath Hymen ty'd  
     In Love's eternal bands.  
 Ye little gods of love,  
     With roses strew the ground,  
     And all around  
     In sportive play  
     Proclaim the happy day.

[Act II or III ?]

*Calliope's Song*

Admetus sleeping.

*Aria-Soprano* [first version]

Gentle Morpheus, son of night,  
 Hither speed thy airy flight!  
 And his weary senses steep  
 In the balmy dew of sleep.

*and Cleopatra claim the song and Brave as one, the other fair.* (This would be a valuable addition to the small repertoire of wedding music used in England.)

<sup>15</sup> Words and music of this chorus were used again in the cantata *Heroules* (1752); the music, however, had already been used in the interlude *The Choece of Heroules* (1750).

That, like Phoebus, blithe and gay,  
 He may rise  
 With surprise,  
 And retake the cheerful day.  
 Gentle Morpheus . . . (Da Capo)

*Aria-Soprano* [final version]  
 Gentle Morpheus, son of night,  
 Hither speed thy airy flight!  
 And his weary senses steep  
 In the balmy dew of sleep.  
 That when bright Aurora's beams  
 Glad the world with golden streams,  
 He, like Phoebus, blith and gay,  
 May retaste the healthful day.  
 Gentle Morpheus . . . (Da Capo.)<sup>16</sup>

#### ACT IV.

Scene, The River Styx.

*Charon, Aria-Basso*

Ye fleeting shades, I come  
 To fix your final doom!  
 Step in both bad and good,  
 And tilt it o'er the flood;  
 To Pluto's dreary shore  
 I'll waft you safely o'er  
 With this my ebon pole  
 Tho' high the waters roll.  
 The monarch and the slave  
 Alike admission have,  
 Nor can I brook delay;  
 Haste, haste, ye shades, away!  
 Ye fleeting shades . . . (Da Capo)

*Chorus in Pluto's Palace*

Thrice happy who in life excel,  
 Hence doom'd in Pluto's courts to dwell,  
 Where ye immortal mortals reign,  
 Now free from sorrow, free from pain

*To Alceste*

*Aria-Tenor* [Pluto?]

Enjoy the sweet Elysian grove,<sup>17</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Handel wrote different music for each of these varying stanzas. The final version was sung, with new words, by Mrs Arne as *Hercules*, in the interlude *The Choice of Hercules* (1750).

<sup>17</sup> Alternative: "Welcome to the Elysian grove."



Seat of pleasure, seat of love,<sup>18</sup>  
 Pleasure that can never cloy,  
 Love the source of endless joy.  
     Thus, thou unpolluted shade,  
     Be thy royal virtues paid  
 Enjoy . . . (Da Capo.)<sup>19</sup>

*Chorus*

Thrice happy . . . (Da Capo)  
 [Another Scene]

*Calliope sings to Admetus*

*Aria-Soprano* [first version]

Come Fancy, empress of the brain,  
 And bring the choicest of thy train  
 To soothe the widow'd monarch's pain!  
     Let fair Alceste still display  
     Her charms, as on the bridal day.  
 Come Fancy . . . (Da Capo)

*Aria-Soprano* [final version]

Come Fancy, empress of the brain,  
 And bring the choicest of thy train  
 To soothe the widow'd monarch's pain!  
     Close by his side  
     In mimic pride  
     Let fair Alceste still display  
     Her charms, as on the bridal day.  
 Come Fancy . . . (Da Capo.)<sup>20</sup>

[Finale Scene]

*Symphony*

before and during the entry of Alcides [Hercules]

*Recitativo-Tenor* (*Attendant*)

He comes, he rises from below,  
 With glorious conquest on his brow.

*Chorus*

All hail, thou mighty son of Jove!  
 How great thy pow'r! how great thy love!  
     Fiends, Furies, Gods, all yield to thee,<sup>21</sup>  
     And Death hath set his captive free  
 All hail . . . (Da Capo.)

<sup>18</sup> Cp. the second line of Dryden-Purcell's air *Fairest Isle* (*King Arthur*).  
 "Seat of pleasure and of love"

<sup>19</sup> Words and music were used again in *The Choice of Hercules* (1750),  
 sung by Mr Lowe as the Attendant on Pleasure.

<sup>20</sup> Handel wrote different music for each of these varying stanzas.

<sup>21</sup> Handel and Arnold wrote "Friends . . .," Chrysander corrected the  
 word.

*Sinfonia**Recitativo-Tenor (Apollo)*

From high Olympus' top, the seat of God,  
 Descend Apollo and his tuneful choir,  
 With all their sportive train, to celebrate  
 Thy great and gen'ious triumph, son of Jove,  
 And hail Admetus with his happy bride.  
 Sing ye, ye shepherds, sing, and tread the ground  
 In mazy dances, and let shouts of joy  
 Return in echo from the vaulted sky.

*Aria-Tenor [Apollo]*

Tune your harps, all ye Nine,  
 To the loud-sounding lays,  
 While the glad nations join  
 In the great victor's praise!  
 Sing his praise, sing his pow'r,  
 That in this joyful hour  
 Bless'd our monarch's arms  
 With the fair in all her charms.

(Segue il Ballo.)

*Ballo Primo**L'ultimo Ballo**Chorus*

Triumph, thou glorious son of Jove,  
 Triumph, happy pair, in love!  
 Valour's prize, virtue's claim,  
 Endless love, eternal fame!

*FINIS.*

[Additional, or rejected, Air ]

*Aria [-Soprano] (Syren)*

Thetis bids me hither fly  
 With this treasure of the main,  
 Emblem of the circling joy  
 That shall crown thy blissful reign.

There may be doubt about the literary value of Smollett's lyrics for *Alceste*; several of them are certainly conventional. We may also question the truth of Handel's utterance, if, indeed, it was his own, about the immortality which he would have brought to Smollett had the work been produced. The history of music proves that only in very rare cases an opera, still less a play with incidental music, could earn immortality for both author and composer.

Smollett was able to look after himself on the road to immortality and his road did not lead by way of the stage, where Handel was much more at home than the poet. But even Handel's immortality did not rise from the stage.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> I list here some of the mistakes that occur in works dealing with the subject:

B. Victor, in his *History of the Theatres of London*, states that one of the decorations by Servandoni, used for *The Rape of Proserpine* in 1769, had been stored in Covent Garden for about thirty years, i. e. since c. 1739, the architect, however, did not come to London until 1749. Victor, who knew nothing about *Alceste*, also tells us that Rich while manager had no plans to exhibit the scenery.

John Hawkins, in his *History of Music*, states that Handel used the music written to *Alceste* for his *Ode on St. Cecilia's Day* (written ten years before), this statement, corrected as early as 1857 in Handel literature, was accepted by all the later writers on Smollett.

Samuel Arnold entitled the first edition of *Alceste*. *Alcides*, i. e. Hercules, and called it an opera. Quinault's libretto for Lully (1674) was, in fact, entitled *Alceste ou le Triomphe d'Alcide*.

John Moore, in his *Memoir of Smollett*, states that Smollett was asked by Rich, in about 1746, to write an opera (i. e. a libretto), that a quarrel between the two frustrated the performance and resulted in Smollett writing his satire of 1747 (*Reproof*).

Alexander Chalmers, in his *Life of Smollett*, noticed that the *Ode on St. Cecilia's Day* was written in 1739, as stated by Burney, and therefore completely mistrusted Hawkins' statement of Handel's music to *Alceste*.

V. Schoelcher, in his *Handel Catalogue* (MS, Conservatoire, Paris) states that Smollett's tragedy was based on the story of *Romeo and Juliet*.

W. S. Rockstro, in his *Handel Biography*, states that it was founded on Euripides' *Alkestis*.

F. Chrysander, who in 1864 still hoped to find Smollett's play and in 1887 intended to write a special essay on *Alceste*, makes only one slight mistake in the preface to his edition. He failed to recognize the identity of a fragmentary poem, set by Handel to a tune of *Alceste*, with the words of a song in *Belshazzar* (1745) which Handel tried to adapt to the first versions of the two Calliope airs for the revival of that oratorio in 1758. The poem, by Charles Jennens, begins 'The leafy honours of the field.' The complete adaptation to *Gentle Morpheus* is not yet printed; the fragmentary adaptation to *Come Fancy* was published by Chrysander at the end of *Alceste*; both versions are in the King's Music Library. Furthermore, Chrysander did not indicate the source of other songs inserted in *Alexander Balus* and *Hercules*, nor did he publish a concordance of the *Alceste* tunes used in *The Choice of Hercules*.

H. S. Buck, in his *Smollett as Poet* (1927), still doubted whether Handel wrote any music to *Alceste* at all. Nevertheless, Buck states that the lines on Handel in Smollett's satire *Advice*, written in 1746, relate to *Alceste* (1749).

## CONCLUSION

In preparing his article, mentioned above, Mr. Knapp must have been very persevering, for there is no other way of finding an author's poems in the British Museum *Catalogue of printed Music published between 1487 and 1800* than by searching through every entry from beginning to end, and this catalogue consists of about 3000 columns Octavo. In these two volumes, the names of the authors are indicated only in the description and where the authors are not given in the titles, they have been included, where possible, within square brackets. No cross-references are to be found to the authors, because the work is a catalogue of music only. The British Museum General Catalogue, moreover, is in no way connected with the Music Catalogue, except that in very rare cases a cross-reference may be found, *e. g.*, under Robert Burns there is a cross-reference to George Thomson's music-books, *A Select Collection of Original Scotch Aurs for the Voice, etc.*, 1793 etc. On the other hand, according to British Museum's practice, books of illustrations, *e. g.*, to Shakespeare's works, may be entered in the General Catalogue, in spite of the fact that the British Museum has its own Print Room, the separate catalogue of which contains, of course, also prints published in the form of a book. Music books, however, are excluded from the General Catalogue, even if they are in closer relationship to literature than are illustrations.

To make things worse for the scholar of literature, the authors of single poems in song collections are not mentioned in the printed catalogues of music. The *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* also has something to say about such collections, *e. g.*, of the 18th century; but it does not say enough, and what it says is not always correct. The same may be said of Karl Goedeke's *Grundriss der deutschen Dichtung* in the matter of vocal music. Neither of these reference-books offers real help in the search for authors of poems in song collections.

The type of literature about which we speak is to be found in collections of songs by different composers, and in songs printed as supplements to magazines and almanacs—all of these lie in the 'no-man's-land' between literature and music. Songs from British magazines are listed in William Barclay Squire's British Museum *Catalogue* mentioned above, and Arthur Goldschmidt's type-written list *Musik im Almanach* (Leipzig, 1935, with indexes of authors

and composers) affords help in this direction for songs in German almanacs. *English Song-Books* of the second half of the 17th century, are listed in the exemplary bibliography by Day and Murrie (London, 1940, with indexes of authors and composers).

Some people may think the libretto of a famous opera is of more literary interest in connection with the author of its plot than a book of minor illustrations to the play or novel on which the libretto is based. The following works are listed only as typical examples showing the connection between plays, or novels, and music:

Purcell's music to *Tempest*,  
Mendelssohn's music to *Midsummer Night's Dream*,  
Wagner's opera *Rienzi*,  
Verdi's opera *Falstaff*,  
Richard Strauss' opera *Salome*.

As with operas, the text of oratorios and cantatas may have been printed separately. In such cases they would be entered in the General Catalogue; even libretti founded on novels, *e. g.*, by Walter Scott, are entered there. If, on the other hand, no libretto has been published one may find that even a lengthy poem makes its first appearance with the music, *e. g.*, the text of Haydn's *Creation*, said to have been translated and arranged by Gottfried van Swieten from a poem by an English author named Lindley.

Among other examples of this type of literature may be mentioned: poems written for music, selected for music, substituted for another poem in a song, written to instrumental music, adapted to such a piece; furthermore, translations, adapted translations, re-translations, etc. Here are some examples of English poems found in music, all of which are somewhat remarkable:

Sheridan's poem 'The Answer to Dr. Percy's Song *O Nancy*,' set by Thomas Linley, s. sh. fol., first printing<sup>23</sup>

Burney's translations to Haydn's *Austrian Hymn*, s. sh. fol., first printing<sup>24</sup>

Scott's translation of Goethe's *Erkönig*, adapted to Schubert's song<sup>25</sup>

Byron's poem 'Fare Thee Well' adapted to a Duet from Mozart's opera *La Clemenza di Tito*, s. sh. fol.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Cf. *Notes & Queries* (186, 1), 1 January 1944 (A. Loewenberg).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *The Music Review* (IV, 3), August 1943, pp. 157-162 (O. E. Deutsch).

<sup>25</sup> In the musical almanac *The Cadeau*, London 1832.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. *TLS.*, 18 September, 1937, p. 680 (Davidson Cook).

It is desirable, therefore, that some means be found of including entries of music titles in the General Catalogue, if there is any special reason for so doing. No hard and fast rule is contemplated but we only ask that occasional discretion should be allowed. For instance, these entries may be confined to authors of national importance and, of course, only to those works making their first, and sometimes their only, appearance in music, or for some particular reason.

At the beginning of the 19th century, some European libraries handled music as a strange element among books and their librarians were only interested in the words, *i. e.*, vocal music. In our more enlightened age, with its stricter observance of 'Rooms' and 'Departments,' it may be useful to attract the interest of librarians to the vast cemetery of Literature buried in Music.

OTTO ERICH DEUTSCH

Cambridge, England

---

#### ON THE PERSONS IN DRYDEN'S *ESSAY OF DRAMATIC POESY*

It will never be known exactly what historical persons lie behind the names in the dialogues of Plato and T. S. Eliot. Nor can we ever discover to what extent Dryden had actual friends in mind when he conceived his characters for the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*. From the *entrepreneurs* of Sarasin and of Desmarets, he knew well the heuristic value of bringing together various speakers, each presenting a different point of view, to discuss the principles of dramatic poesy. And yet he tells us near the beginning that ". . . three of them are persons whom their wit and quality have made known to all the town; and whom I have chose to hide under these borrowed names . . ." (28:21-29:2).<sup>1</sup> As this appears to be a true statement, Malone wrote a long account identifying the characters with actual people.<sup>2</sup> Except for George Hardinge's

<sup>1</sup> I have used the first edition (1668) as edited by W P Ker, *Essays of John Dryden* (Oxford, 1926), 2 vols. Documentation will consist of references to the first volume of this edition by page and line numbers, and will be incorporated, as here, within my text.

<sup>2</sup> Edmund Malone, *The Critical and Miscellaneous Prose Works of John*

railing *Essence of Malone*,<sup>3</sup> scarcely a word has been raised to challenge Malone's identifications of the four speakers: Crites as Sir Robert Howard, Eugenius as Charles Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, later sixth Earl of Dorset; Lisideus as Sir Charles Sedley; and Neander as Dryden himself.<sup>4</sup>

The purpose of this paper is to show that a mistake has been made in concentrating more on Dryden's "three persons of quality" than on his insistence that he had chosen to "hide [them] under these borrowed names"; that too great an anxiety to accept as fact the hypothesis that his persons are portraits may have prevented us from perceiving the general, dramatic functions of the speakers in the dialogue. I shall take up the four characters in the order in which Dryden introduces them. Though they may have started as portraits they soon became and remain embodiments of attitude necessitated by the argument.

Crites is the first speaker. And it so happens that his case shows most obviously the part-personal and most clearly the part-personifying function; furthermore, this is the only identification that has been seriously challenged in modern times.

The background of the quarrel between Dryden and his brother-in-law is so well known that there is no need to repeat it here. On the grounds of the coincidence of some of Crites' opinions and those of Sir Robert Howard's published work, Malone settled on this identification. At one time he believed that Crites could have been Lord Roscommon<sup>5</sup> because of Crites' interest in Horace; but acknowledging his error, he returned to Sir Robert.<sup>6</sup> In 1923

*Dryden* (London, 1800), Vol. I, part II. Cf. the summary in Hugh Macdonald, *John Dryden: A Bibliography of Early Editions and of Drydeniana* (Oxford, 1939), p. 165, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Minutius Felix [George Hardinge] *Essence of Malone* (London, 1800), pp. 83 ff; 2nd edition, enlarged, pp. 10 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *The Essay of Dramatic Poesy* has been edited by distinguished hands, notably. Robert Urie in 1750, Malone, 1800, Scott, 1808; Arber, 1880, Saintsbury, 1882; Thomas Arnold, 1889; Strunk, 1898 and Ker, 1900. Examples of recent scholars who carry on the tradition of Malone's identifications are: Churton Collins, *Essays and Studies* (London, 1895), p. 30; J. N. Smith and E. W. Parks, *The Great Critics* (New York, 1939), p. 304, V. de Sola Pinto, *Sir Charles Sedley* (London, 1927), p. 89, n. 1 and p. 15, n. 1; L. I. Bredvold, *The Best of Dryden* (New York, 1933), p. 558; etc.

<sup>5</sup> Malone, I, II, 34.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, I, II, 117.

G. R. Noyes<sup>7</sup> threw considerable doubt on Malone's identification. In Howard's prefaces Sir Robert (1) attacks the use of rime in drama, (2) argues for the preeminence of English drama over that of Greece and Rome, and (3) attacks the authority of the three unities. Of these views, however, the Crites of the *Essay* advances only the first, and differs radically from the second and the third. It was perhaps for this reason that the literary quarrel between Dryden and his brother-in-law had to center on the use of rime in drama. At the end of his article Noyes, though admitting that Dryden does not mention Roscommon by name earlier than 1680,<sup>8</sup> is inclined, like Malone, to identify Crites with Roscommon on the strength of the allusions to Horace.

Crites, characterized more at length than any of the others, is ". . . a person of sharp judgment, and somewhat too delicate a taste in wit, which the world have mistaken in him for ill-nature . . ." (29:28-29).<sup>9</sup> Since the purpose of the whole piece ". . . was chiefly to vindicate the honour of our English writers . . ." (27:12-15), the person to oppose the English and the modern point of view had to be a Crites. Simple though this may be, no other explanation can adequately show us why, if Dryden intended Crites to be his brother-in-law Sir Robert Howard, he made Crites so different in many of his views from Sir Robert. Crites, therefore, is not so much an individual as he is a typical ultra-conservative. The name is appropriate for a person who is a strong defender of Greek and Latin literature, but a carping criticaster of anything new.

Eugenius is the second speaker. Malone<sup>10</sup> identified him with Charles Lord Buckhurst (later the sixth Earl of Dorset) on the sole ground that Matthew Prior, in the dedication of his 1709 edition of *Poems* to Lionel, Earl of Dorset, acclaimed Lionel's late father as the Eugenius of Dryden's *Essay*. This single proof is taken from a preface conceived, forty years after the *Essay* was published, in a spirit of glowing encomium.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>7</sup> "Crites" in Dryden's *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, *MLN*, xxxviii (1923), 333-37.

<sup>8</sup> In the preface to *Ovid's Epistles*, Ker, I, 237. 33

<sup>9</sup> That Malone had difficulty maintaining either of his first two identifications is shown by his admission (I, ii, 35) that "too delicate a taste in wit" seems to apply better to Charles Lord Buckhurst.

<sup>10</sup> I, ii, 62.

<sup>11</sup> Brice Harris, *Charles Sackville, Sixth Earl of Dorset*. ("Illinois Studies



But several pieces of evidence militate against this identification. For one thing, Dryden had dedicated his *Essay* to Lord Buckhurst. If the Eugenius within the *Essay* is also Lord Buckhurst, he can scarcely be said to play the role of neutral arbiter which Dryden enjoined upon his noble patron in the "Epistle Dedicatory." He opposes Crites quite roundly, and looks upon Neander "earnestly" as he "beseeches" Neander to "gratify the company, and me in particular" (79.17-21) with the characters of Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher, and Jonson. Far from being impartial, Eugenius is definitely on Neander's side of the argument (33: 20-30). The long passage (Ker, II, 16-17) in Dryden's dedication to the same Lord Buckhurst of his essay on *Satire* in 1693, which links his noble patron once more to the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, makes no mention of Buckhurst as the Eugenius of the *Essay*. Neither of the two surviving letters written by Dryden to Buckhurst mentions the identification with Eugenius.<sup>12</sup> This by itself is not extraordinary, yet the first letter, written within ten years of the publication of the *Essay*, might have offered a fine opportunity, since its subject matter is Dryden's contemplated reply to Rymer's diatribe against the playwrights of the Elizabethan age whom both Eugenius and Neander so revere. Finally, it appears that Charles Sackville Lord Buckhurst had volunteered in the fleet fitted out against the Dutch, and had taken part in the great naval battle of June 3, 1665, near Lowestoft whose effect from a distance upon the four friends Dryden so movingly describes in his poem.<sup>13</sup> Would his sense of drama, while allowing him to dedicate the *Essay* to an absent friend and patron, have allowed him to include that absent friend in a 'play' whose setting and dramatic occasion is the very day of that battle?

Eugenius, rather, signifies merely "well born." He is a foil to

in *Language and Literature*, xxvi, Nos. 3-4, Urbana, Illinois, 1940), Preface, pp. 5-6: "Prior was either not sure of his facts or not averse to twisting them to his own ends. Grief over Dorset's recent death and too close proximity to his subject make this biography a kind of mausoleum, so that however valuable, it must yet be used with discretion."

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Charles E. Ward, *The Letters of John Dryden* (Durham, N. C., 1942), No. 6 (c. 1677) and No. 22 (c. 1691).

<sup>13</sup> The knowledge comes to us, again, from Prior's 1709 dedication, but Bruce Harris (*Charles Sackville*, pp. 33-34) accepts the grounds as plausible. Cf. *DNB*, L, 87.

Neander, for whom no claims of birth are made but whose tastes are the same. The character within the *Essay* enjoys the deference of the other persons. He puts an end to the quarrel between Crites and Lisideus over the bad poets; and on his general proposition that today's poets are better than any England has yet produced ". . . all of them were thus far of Eugenius his opinion" (35:9). The other persons side with Eugenius at the end of his argument with Crites (55:30). Throughout the *Essay*, Eugenius, the "well born," stands as a symbol of the man of quality who has good taste. Can more be gained by thinking of him as Lord Buckhurst?

Identifying the third speaker, Lisideus, gave Malone the greatest difficulty. At last it occurred to him that Lisideus must be Sir Charles Sedley. The grounds for this identification, which has not been questioned since, are (1) that Sedley was a friend of Buckhurst, hence if Eugenius is Buckhurst, then Sedley could appropriately be with him; (2) that Sedley was a great voluptuary, and at the end of the dialogue, while the graver Neander and Crites go home to bed, the two others seek the pleasure of the town; (3) that Lisideus is an anagram for Sidleyus, the Latinized form of the actual spelling of the name "Sidley."<sup>14</sup>

It is difficult to determine whether the views of Lisideus on drama coincide with those held by the author of *Antony and Cleopatra* (1677). Nor is anything to be gained by searching for other historical persons whose characters and views might be made to fit Lisideus by more rigorous standards than Malone used to identify the character with Sir Charles Sedley. But if the mere acceptance of this identification keeps us from seeing the allegorical function of the character, then the acceptance is harmful.

Lisideus is prevailed upon by his friends to give the "definition" of a play, which is the starting point of the whole argument and its primary source of unity. Lisideus knew, too, that this was not a definition but merely his "notion" of what he thought a play "ought to be" (36:5-8). The third speaker, Lisideus, is the first to uphold the moderns (the French rather than the English), in the debate between the ancients and moderns. For Eugenius before him served to tell, in arguing with Crites, not so much what

<sup>14</sup> George Hardinge had greatest fun with this anagram. Cf. *Essence of Malone* (1800), p. 84: "The reader will not forget, that, upon the difference between SIDLEY and SEDLEY, the life and soul of the imputed *anagram* depend."

the moderns have accomplished as what the ancients had failed to do. As all the speakers do, *Lisideus* speaks to certain parts of the definition of a play, but his particular function is to counter the "just" with the "lively" portion of the agreed-upon formula; to add to ancient "instruction" the French "delight", and to show that the French attain these things not so much through the "passions and humours" in the characters as through superiority in plotting, i.e. "the changes of fortune" of the definition. His whole argument is based not on the well known "justness" of the French but on the way in which the French make plot the "lively" means to the end of the concernment in the audience. *Lisideus* begins his speech with *Corneille* (56:26-32), and throughout his argument, as throughout the entire *Essay*, there is constant and frank allusion to *Corneille's Trois Discours* (1660), which has long been known to be the most important source for Dryden's *Essay*.

For these reasons we may well look towards France and especially towards *Corneille* for a clue to the origin of *Lisideus*. For the name does not appear on the surface to be as clearly Greek as the names *Crites*, *Eugenius*, and *Neander*. Is it rash to suggest, therefore, that in commemoration of the notorious controversy in France over *Le Cid*, the name "*Lisideus*" may have come to Dryden from "*Le Cid*" plus a Latinized-Greek masculine ending?<sup>15</sup> Could a young English craftsman and critic like Dryden, poring over a copy of the *Trois Discours* at the Howard estate in Wiltshire, fail to link his spokesman for the best in the French theatre with that reverberating victory of *Corneille's* over the Academicians? In this connection, one of the greatest editors of the *Essay*, Arnold, quotes a letter which *Corneille* wrote to the Abbé de Pure on August 25, 1660, on the occasion and subject matter of the famous *Discourses*:

Je suis à la fin d'un travail fort pénible sur une matière fort délicate J'ai traité en trois préfaces les principales questions de l'art poétique sur mes trois volumes de comédies J'y ai fait quelques explications nouvelles d'Aristote, et avancé quelques propositions et quelques maximes inconnues à nos anciens. J'y réfute celles sur lesquelles l'Académie a fondé la condamnation du *Cid*, et ne suis pas d'accord avec M. d'Aubignac de tout le bien même qu'il a dit de moi.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup> A precedent which exemplifies the linguistic principle would be *Apuleus*, i.e. the man who has something to do with *Apulia*.

<sup>16</sup> Quoted by Arnold, *Dryden: An Essay of Dramatic Poesy* (Oxford, 1922), p. 146, from the *Grands Ecrivains* edition, x, 485.

This is not to identify Lisideus with Corneille or any other historical person, but rather with an appropriate symbol for the speaker in the dialogue who upholds the new French theatre in the spirit of Corneille, one of whose antagonists in the dialogue is as carping an academician as Crites. In the words of William Strunk, who admirably epitomizes the influence of Corneille in the *Essay*, Corneille's ". . . own plays had been censured as departing from the ancient rules, and in the *Discours* he examines the ancient authorities, interprets them liberally, and, so far as he can, justifies his practice by them" <sup>17</sup> This practically describes the function of Lisideus, within the *Essay*, and describes it more profitably than does a strained identification of Lisideus with Sir Charles Sedley coupled with a dismissal of further enquiry into his meaning.

Finally, how do we know that Neander was intended to be Dryden himself? Neander's views certainly come closer to those of Dryden than do those of any of the other speakers. Malone <sup>18</sup> was led to the identification, also, by the anagram with Dryden's name. And "Neander" was used for Dryden in the *Luctus Britannici* (1700) and in Mrs. Thomas's *Poems* of 1727 <sup>19</sup>—both instances of complimentary metaphor.

Although Neander uses many of Dryden's own arguments, he by no means is a constant speaker of them, any more than Crites is of Sir Robert's dicta on the drama. In the first edition of the *Essay*, Dryden uses direct address (89:32) in passing from his second to his third main section; and here he uses "I," meaning himself apart from Neander, and "my Lord," meaning Buckhurst quite apart from Eugenius. In the *Defense*, too, Dryden distinguishes between his own views and those of his imaginary character: ". . . several persons maintained their several opinions . . .; he who answered, in behalf of our nation, was willing to give more latitude to the rule. . . . In few words my own opinion is this . . ." (130:18-26). In spite of Dryden's insistence upon the sceptical spirit of his "essai," his literal-minded brother-in-law took everything Crites said as directed towards himself and everything Neander said as coming straight from Dryden. That Neander's views come closest

<sup>17</sup> Dryden: *Essays on the Drama* (New York, 1898), Introd., xxvi.

<sup>18</sup> I, ii, 34 f. n., 63, 118. Malone has a strong argument in quotation of the *Essay* (94:6-7) on Neander's writing of verse.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Macdonald, p. 165, n. 1. The Mrs. Thomas is, of course, "Corinna," noted for her extravagant account of Dryden's funeral.

to Dryden's own, however, is merely to say that Dryden himself represents the "new" against the "old." In a discourse which concerns the idea of progress in letters, "Neander" is allegorically the "new man," from *neo* and *andros*, as his name so clearly implies.<sup>20</sup>

I cannot quite deny, in conclusion, that Dryden had actual friends in mind when he created the persons in his dialogue. I insist, however, that Malone's identifications have been too little examined, and that this readiness to accept the historical meanings of the names perhaps has blinded us to some of Dryden's dramatic intentions. Surely the latter kind of meaning is more appropriately sought in a creative work of this kind, and is more important as the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* ceases to be a document published for Dryden's friends or enemies and becomes, instead, a landmark in the history of English prose criticism.

FRANK LIVINGSTONE HUNTLEY

*University of Michigan*

---

### THE JUDGE IN THE *MEIER HELMBRECHT*

"Nû hoert daz maere mit spruchen	1651
wie die diebe kruchen	
fur gericht mit ir burden . . .	1653
Dô wart fursprechen niht gegeben.	1669
der in lengen wil ir leben,	1670
dem kurze got daz sîne	
daz sint die wunsche mîne.	
ich weiz den rihter sô gemuot:	
ein wilder wolf, gaebe im der guot,	
bizze er im und allen luten vihe,	1675
von der wârheit ich des gihe,	
er lieze in umbe guot genesen,	
swie des doch niht solde wesen.	
Der scherge dô die nune hie.	" <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> This point was almost made by Arnold, *Introd.*, p. ix, but he believed it impossible that Dryden should think of himself as a "novus homo" in the sense of a commoner desiring to rise above his station.

<sup>1</sup> All *Helmbrecht* quotations are from Friedrich Panzer, *Meier Helmbrecht*, Halle: 1929.

With these lines, the story of the farmer's son who set out to become a knight and ended as a thief and robber reaches one of its high points. In the structure of the plot it is the turning point. When we have reached this passage, we realize that all that preceded was the tying of the knot, leading up to this, inexorably. And we feel that all that is to follow will merely fill the measure of retribution that has finally set in. The ladder of Helmbrecht's fortunes has no more rungs; with his next step we will see his fall into the misery which he must pass through before he comes to his shameful end.

The setting for this scene is dramatic and tense. Helmbrecht has left his father's farm for good, and has returned to his comrades. His sister Gotelint is with him. She has just been married to her brother's comrade-in-crime Lemberslint. In the midst of a loud and lavish wedding feast, Gotelint is gripped by a sense of dread. Certain persons are drawing near, and she feels that their coming bodes evil. She is right, it is the judge, who has come with four constables: . . . *zehant sach man komen den rihter selpfünfte. mit der sigenünfte gesigete er den zehen* (Helmbrecht and his gang) *an* 1612-15. This figure of the judge, surrounded by four officers of the law, as he puts a sudden end to the mirth and revelries of the wedding banquet, is, by sheer contrast, full of august solemnity. To us he is nothing less than the instrument through which the moral justice which we demand finds its fulfilment.

The poet goes to great lengths in creating an atmosphere of awe around these persons of law and order. For this he uses the popular belief of the "Schergenbann," according to which criminals found themselves powerless and paralyzed when a sheriff approached them. We had an echo of this in lines 1257 ff., where Young Helmbrecht boasted of his deeds of valor and the skill of his band of robbers. The old Meier replied soberly: *sô got wil selbe wachen, sô kan ein scherger machen daz sie tretent swie er wil, waer ir noch drî stunt als vil* 1261-64. This theme is brought up twice more in connection with the arrest at the wedding feast (1622 ff. and 1639 ff.). Moreover, it has a religious sheen cast over it, for we hear that the *scherge* possesses this power as the executor of the Supreme Will, which demands that a wrong be expiated. It is God himself who works the charm: *got ist ein wunderaere* 1639; and it is God who demands atonement for the crime: *sô got der räche wil selbe phlegen*

1650. Hence, when the judge comes to arrest the thieves, these braves, who had not feared two-, three- or fourfold numbers in former days (1254, 1619, 1624), turn into lily-livered cowards who crawl under benches and hide in corners to escape their condign punishment. But in vain; one by one they are dragged forth and taken to court, with evidence of their crime in plain sight: the skins of cows are bound on their backs as symbolic proof of their evil deeds. This gives the judge a clear case: *ieglich truoc sin burde mit im hin. daz was des rihters gewin* 1668.

The hour of judgment has come for Helmbrecht and his companions. Can there be any doubt about the outcome? The *Meier Helmbrecht* was written as a homily on conduct. The concluding lines of the poem put this beyond question. The import of the poem is didactic. It is the very core of the story that these bandits could bully and violate defenseless peasants and unprotected merchants, but that they are utterly impotent in the presence of the law. As we have seen, the law and its representatives are not so much agents of an outraged society, as they are the vicegerents of the Deity, which bestows awesome and supernatural powers upon them to this end. And now, when the law has caught up with these criminals, they will surely have to pay the extreme penalty for their many evil and cruel deeds. Every reader and listener expects nothing less, and it would jar us indeed if there were the slightest doubt about the attitude the court should take in this matter.

I can hardly understand how, in view of these context data, the prevailing interpretation of the lines *ich weiz den rihter sô gemuot* etc. has gone unchallenged for so long. For the poet makes it plain that he wants these bandits hung, and hung fast: *dô wart fürsprechen niht gegeben. der in lengen wil ir leben, dem kurze got daz sine: daz sint die wunsche mine* 1669-72. There follows the statement about the judge's thoughts on this: *ich weiz den rihter sô gemuot*, etc. and this is followed by 1679: *der scherge dô die niune hie*. As the *scherge* could not have hung them unless the court had ordered them to be hung, the judge must have condemned them first. There can be no question that the most natural reading of lines 1673 would be that the judge, too, had no intention of prolonging their lives, and so they were, in fact, hung on the spot. This is roughly what we would expect to find here, and my argument is that, if we can get some such meaning out of these lines (1673-78), it should be preferred to other interpretations.

The customary interpretation of these lines differs from this, however. There is one school which holds that the passage means: if Helmbrecht and his gang had been able to offer enough goods and money to the judge, the judge would have accepted the bribe and let them go free, a thing he ought not to have even considered. But, and this is implied, "zwischen den Zeilen zu lesen," as they were unable to satisfy the greed of the judge, they were condemned and hung. I believe Friedrich Keinz<sup>2</sup> was the first to hold this, and scholars and translators seem to have followed him rather uncritically. Thus, Panzer says in his introduction p. xviii, "nicht bloss den Dorper trifft [Wernhers] Spott, sondern auch die uppige Nonne, den ungerechten Richter . . ." (However, Panzer's words may also refer to the second interpretation discussed below.) A recent German translation (Johannes Ninck, *Meier Helmbrecht* Versnovelle, Leipzig: Reclam, 1938) reads, "Des Richters Sinn ist so gestellt. Gab ihm ein wilder Wolf nur Geld, Der arg der Leute Vieh zerbiss, Den liess'—ich weiss es ganz gewiss—Ums Geld er los schneeweiss und rein. Das durfte nie und nimmer sein."

I think this interpretation falls down as soon as we show that the implication that the thieves could not pay enough cannot be defended. And it cannot be. In fact, we are told that the gang had amassed loot of considerable value in a number of ways, and it was Helmbrecht in particular who must have possessed quite a fortune. For in lines 660 ff. we learn that, after an apprenticeship of only one year, Helmbrecht had become the head of the gang, and had always got the best share of the plunder (686). When Helmbrecht returns home to his father's farm, he brings gifts of considerable value for his mother and his sister (1067 ff.). But the others were no paupers either. When Helmbrecht tries to persuade his sister to marry Lemberslint, he tells her that Lemberslint has a dowry ready for her that is anything but trifling (1326 ff.). Of the bountiful wedding feast, the poet says with effective *litotes*: *diu höchzit was niht arm* (1551). Hence, there is every reason to believe that the thieves could have paid enough *guot* to satisfy even an unduly greedy judge. Therefore, the interpretation believed in by Keinz and his followers is untenable.

A second school of interpreters takes the lines 1673 ff. as a

<sup>2</sup> Friedrich Keinz, *Helmbrecht und seine Heimat*, Leipzig. 1887, p. 91 (quoted after Gough, see footnote 4).



satirical aside on the judiciary of the times. They hold that, after the forceful words in 1669 ff., where the poet leaves no doubt about his own wishes concerning the fate of the thieves, Wernher suddenly breaks his straight narrative and throws a scare into his audience by talking about corrupt judges who, in similar circumstances, have set robbers like Helmbrecht free upon payment of a "fine." But—and this again is implied, "wieder zwischen den Zeilen zu lesen"—this judge was not of this caliber, and the thieves were condemned and hung. A good example of this point of view is found in the translation by M. Oberbreyer (Leipzig: Reclam, 1878): "Des Richters Sinn ist oft bestellt, Dass, gab ein wilder Wolf ihm Geld, Und hatt' er alles Vieh geraubt—Ich rede hier die Wahrheit, glaubt!—Er ihn doch wider Recht lasst leben, Weil er Geschenke ihm gegeben. Doch jetzt die Neun er hangen liess." The standard English translation by C. H. Bell (*Peasant Life in Old Germanic Epics*, New York. Columbia University Press, 1931) reads: "I know a judge, of such a mind That if a wolf of wildest kind, That tore men's cattle for its prey, If it but gave him ample pay, For such a bribe he'd set it free, However venal this might be. Nine men were strung up in the air."

This does not seem very plausible to me either. First, note how the translators handle the text: Oberbreyer inserts the word *oft* (and, implied: but not this time), and Bell speaks of *a* judge (and, implied: but not this one). Now some implications might possibly be granted. But there is not a shred of evidence in the text that the line *ich weiz den rihter sô gemuot* suddenly talks about a man who is not identical with the person called *der rihter* only a few lines before (1668: *daz was des rihters gewin*), or who was so awe-inspiringly introduced only a short while before (1612 ff: *dar nâch zehant sach man komen den rihter selpfuntte*, etc.). The chances that Wernher means one and the same man when he speaks of *der rihter* in 1613, 1668, and 1673 are, in my opinion, overwhelming. Moreover, I think the whole argument of this school (Oberbreyer, Bell, and others) is twisted and unsound. For it requires that, despite what we are led to expect of judges, we must understand that the judge sitting on Helmbrecht's case was not corrupt and greedy; but this rather important fact is nowhere plainly stated.

How odd this interpretation is becomes apparent when we realize that it amounts to saying that Wernher tells his story in such a way that highly opprobrious statements are made about the judicature,

which we must, however, not apply to our judge, although we are not told not to. And that, I think, verges on the absurd. It just does not, in my opinion, fit the general tenor of the *Meier Helmbrecht*, where people are usually openly and clearly praised or blamed. Even if the lines 1673 ff. are to be taken as "Spott auf ungerechte Richter," it still seems to me inexplicable why Wernher should have failed to take this opportunity to tell us plainly and, from the point of view of story-telling, effectively, that contrary to usual practice *his* judge was just and honest. It does not seem to fit his narrative style not to do so.<sup>3</sup>

The most recent *Helmbrecht* commentary, by Charles E. Gough,<sup>4</sup> tries another solution. Gough translates on p. xxviii (he also

<sup>3</sup> Modern readers are shocked when they hear that Helmbrecht and his band might have, in the literal sense of the word, "paid" for their crimes with *got*. I quote Jakob Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer* 2 647: "Den erlittenen schaden, insoweit er ersetzbar ist, ersetzt die busse vollig und nicht selten gewahrt sie uberhin; bei unersetzlichem verlust, namentlich todschlag des verwandten oder leiblicher verunstaltung, lasst sich nicht leugnen, hat die ausgleichung der busse etwas unedles und widerstrebendes, das auch schon im alterthum von einzelnen menschen gefuhlt, fur die menge durch allgemeinheit der sitte gemildert wurde und endlich nach dem fortschritt unserer ausbildung die abschaffung solcher bussen verur-sachte." But it is well to realize at this point that, no matter how this passage is read, the *legality* of such an action by the judge is not disputed. He might have been morally wrong in setting them free, but he seems to have had unquestioned judicial powers to do so. The question comes to mind. does our Helmbrecht passage mirror ancient Germanic law and custom here? A good case can be made out for this. Anyone who has read Old Germanic legal texts knows that practically any crime could be, and often was, expiated by an appropriate payment, and that such payments were not only a fully sanctioned part of public and private litigation, but had also been developed into a system of great refinement and intricacy. Add to this that the curious term "wolf" for a malfeasant corresponds exactly with Old Norse *vargr* "wolf," which also occurs as a legal metaphor and then means "outlaw, felon" (see K. v. Amira, *Grundriss des germanischen Rechts* 2 237). This would force us to reject the line *sowe des doch niht solde wesen* as a register of protest against the legality of the judge's action (in the meaning he should not have done that); for he would act entirely within the bounds of established right and approved custom in accepting, or even in considering accepting, *got*. It is worth noting that my own reading, which is based on altogether different reasoning, leads to an interpretation of this line which would in no way contradict such a view, see below.

<sup>4</sup> Charles Gough, *Meier Helmbrecht*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1942.

has a slightly different translation on p. 75, which does not make any sense to me): "I know the judge was of this mind: if a wild wolf should offer him money-payment (in exchange for his life and liberty), the wolf would for all that bite the judge's cattle and other people's herds as well later on. I admit that in all truth (it would so be), if he (= the judge) let him (= the wolf) live on account of a money-payment—a thing that ought not to be." If I understand Gough correctly, he holds that, even if the judge might have considered for a moment levying a fine on the gang instead of hanging them, the judge rejected this idea immediately, because the bandits would no sooner be free than they would start their robberies and murders all over again. This, I believe, is a correct general idea; for now the text requires very little in the way of purely implied information, and we actually find what we had expected to find as the most natural continuation of the story: the judge agrees with the poet that these thieves should not be set free, i. e., be condemned instead. Moreover, Gough's translation tries to take into account a feature of the text tradition which other interpreters seem to have failed to heed completely. The *Meier Helmbrecht* is known from two manuscripts *A* and *B*, of which *A* usually mirrors the "Urtext" more faithfully, while MS *B* shows many deliberate changes, and omits over fifty rhymes entirely. But in our passage, we find that, this time, *B* has two lines more than *A*: *er lieze in umbe guot genesen, swie des doch niht solde wesen* (1677-78) are found only in *B*. On the supposition that the text tradition of *A* is to be preferred, Gough considers these additional lines of *B* as of very doubtful authenticity, merely as a somewhat clumsy attempt to explain the parable contained in 1674-75. Hence, Gough tries to get a translation which will stand just on the text as *A* shows it, and either drops *B*'s additional lines completely, or retains them as an enlargement on the previous lines.

This is sound, but the way Gough translates the text requires several severe alterations in these lines. First, we must change *er liez(e)* to *liez er*, converting a (verb-second) *sentence* into a conditional (verb-first) *clause* ("if he let him live"). Then, in the next line, we must reverse this procedure: we must take the *swie*-*clause* as being actually a main *sentence* as though it were *swie solde des doch niht wesen* or similarly ("a thing that ought not to be"). Thus, the syntax pattern has become completely in-

textual emendation. The ideal emendation would be one that would give us the meaning we are led to expect here, namely that the judge, too, thought that the life of the thieves should not be prolonged. At the same time, our emendation should not rely too firmly on the text of lines 1677-78 for completing syntax forms we are accustomed to, for these lines may have to be thrown out as a wilful addition of the scribe of *B*. In casting about for a solution of this problem, it might be helpful if we restated the problem in terms of syntax requirements: what we need is a main sentence (the conclusion part) in line 1675 as answer to the condition clause *gaebe im* etc. in 1674. The least violence to the text as it has been transmitted to us would be done if we read in line 1675 *bizze êr im unde allen luten vihe*<sup>5</sup> "would sooner bite his and all people's cattle." This would solve all difficulties at one stroke; for it would give us the main sentence we have found wanting so badly. But more. this particular main sentence gives us the option of retaining lines 1677-78 of *B* as a possibly genuine reading. For line 1677 can now be taken as a second main sentence linked to the sentence in 1675 by the comparative *êr*, making 1677 (*er heze in umbe guot genesen*) a comparative sentence. This syntax pattern is mentioned in Paul-Gierach § 334, 2c. And the meaning would be just what we have been looking for all the time. According to the text in *A*, the translation would run as follows: "Nothing in the way of advocate(s) was given there. May God shorten the life of him who wishes to prolong theirs: those are my wishes! I know the judge to be of this mind: a wild wolf, if it gave him money, would sooner (have a chance to) bite his and all people's cattle (than that the judge would prolong their lives)," i. e., it is more likely that an arch-criminal of the type called wolf<sup>6</sup> would be given a

<sup>5</sup> This emendation is not necessarily contradicted by the orthography of the manuscripts, both *A/B* write long *ê* before *r* variously. *ere/ere* 494, *Eere/ere* 496, *Eere/ere* 977, *mere/mere* 987, *mer/me* 1119, etc. There remains the question of meter. No matter how this line is reconstructed, the scansion is not smooth. When I suggest that the least offensive scansion would accent *êr—unde—luten—vihe*, with *allen* read as monosyllabic, I discourage "mine and all people's" possible doubts by pointing to the footnote on p. xvi f. of Panzer's *Helmbrecht*, which chronicles even more astonishing assertions and counter-assertions on metrical questions in the *Helmbrecht* by scholarly experts whose opinion in this field I am usually inclined to follow with acclaim, if not with reverence.

<sup>6</sup> See footnote 3.

second chance by the judge for committing additional robberies and murders than that Helmbrecht and his mates should find their lives prolonged. According to *B*, we would have: ". . . I know the judge to be of this mind: a wild wolf, if he gave him money, would sooner (have a chance to) bite his and all people's cattle—I say this in all truth—than that he let him off for a fine, although indeed nothing of this sort could be," i. e., although this is absolutely impossible anyhow: the line *swie des doch naht solde wesen* merely rejects the supposition entertained in the preceding lines. To me, this is the most plausible interpretation of this difficult passage; moreover, it requires no assumptions that run counter to known syntax patterns of Middle High German.

GEORGE NORDMEYER

*Yale University*

---

#### THE VERGE OF THE COURT AND ARREST FOR DEBT IN FIELDING'S *AMELIA*

When in 1751 Henry Fielding published his last novel, *Amelia*, it was immediately evident that the fun-loving author of *Joseph Andrews* and *Tom Jones* had become more serious; for *Amelia*, in some respects, closely approaches the nature of a tract designed to attack certain abuses in eighteenth-century English law and to expose judicial maladministration by incompetent magistrates. On the basis of this fact, the book can be called one of the first novels-with-a-purpose in England, as it was Fielding's intention to foster reform by revealing the deplorable conditions of the time in regard to these legal matters. Among other items that he specifically assails in *Amelia* are the complicated and oppressive laws concerning arrest and detention for debt. Though the general aspects of these laws are too well known to require comment, two facets of the system, the institution of "the verge of the court" and the procedure for having a debtor seized, are not so widely understood. Because Fielding was himself a magistrate and had intimate knowledge of the intricacies of legal form, he sometimes makes use in *Amelia* of material of this sort that is somewhat lost on the modern reader. It seems, therefore, that a brief examination of the two facets mentioned above will be profitable in bringing about a more complete appreciation of what Fielding does in the novel.

In Captain Booth, the hero of *Amelia*, Fielding portrays a young army officer who is incapable of managing his personal affairs providently and who falls into pecuniary difficulty as a result of the mustering out of his unit and his consequent reduction to half pay. In the course of the novel, Booth is twice arrested for debt, though on each occasion he fortunately escapes commitment to prison but is detained at the house of a bailiff until bail is forthcoming. However, even during the periods when he is not actually under duress, Booth and his family are forced to take up residence in the famed verge of the court in order that the captain may avoid being taken into custody. This immunity from arrest that a debtor enjoyed while living in the verge of the court is an interesting and perhaps little-known aspect of English law of the day.

Historically, the concept of the verge is embodied in the institution of the "King's Peace," an area extending for twelve miles around the seat of the king's court, wherever that might be at any particular time. Within this area the ordinary civil authorities had no power, and any offenses committed within its bounds were construed as having been committed against the person of the king himself and were dealt with, therefore, by the lord steward and marshall of the king's household.<sup>1</sup> This area was gradually restricted and confined and took the name of the verge of the court from the Old French word *verge*, from Latin *vurga*, meaning "a staff," the symbol of the lord steward's office. By the eighteenth

<sup>1</sup> The judicial machinery set up to administer justice in this domain had a long and checkered career. An ancient tribunal in its beginnings (authorized to deal with actions only when both parties were within the jurisdiction of the court), it was given fresh letters patent by Charles I, declined and disappeared under the Protectorate, and was re-established by Charles II, being described by the letters patent of the latter (1633) as *Curia Palatu Regis, Westm*, and popularly known as "The Palace Court." The court seems to have been all but dormant in the eighteenth century, and it was extremely difficult to bring action before it, bribery and influence being the chief means by which such could be accomplished. The number of counsellors and attorneys admitted to practice before the body was strictly limited, and any important proceedings referred to it were usually transferred to some other court for disposition. The Palace Court was abolished in 1849 after sinking to such a low level that it has been described by one writer as "a wicked little tribunal, whose misdeeds had been disclosed in the fullest details to a horrified public" (Theobald Mathew, "The Mayor's Court, the Sheriff's Courts, and the Palace Court," *Juridical Review*, XXI (1919), 135-151.)

century and the time of *Amelia*, the term had come to be applied to a neighborhood of some extent near Whitehall and St. James's in which offenders were free from arrest by the ordinary officers of the law. It was in particular a haven for debtors. The following quotation from Trusler's *London Adviser and Guide* of 1790 will help to make clear the idea and function of the verge of the court:

The Verge of the Court was that ground about Whitehall and St James's which belongs to the Crown, and which is privileged from arrests. The privileged place includes Charing Cross on the north side of the way, from the corner of St Martin's Lane to Hedge Lane, and both the King's Mews. On the south side from the street leading into Spring Gardens to the public house beyond the Treasury, and all Spring Gardens, on the opposite side of the way from Northumberland House to the end of Privy Garden; taking in all Scotland Yard, Whitehall, and Privy Garden. It further includes all the Parks, the Stable-Yard, St. James's, Cleveland Court and all Hyde Park, except the mere crossing from the Green Park to Hyde Park. Most houses in the Verge let lodgings, and I knew an artful fellow once that eluded all his creditors by residing there. if he wanted to go out of it he took water at Whitehall Stairs, which place is privileged; and as no writ can be served on the water without a water-bailiff's warrant, which cannot be immediately procured, he would land safely in the City or on the Surrey side; for a Middlesex writ loses its force in the City and in Surrey, unless backed by a City or Surrey magistrate, which requires time and preparation to get done<sup>2</sup>

In spite, then, of his debts, which amount, so he says, to "near three hundred pounds more than the value of all my effects," Booth is safe from the law as long as he does not venture outside the bounds of the verge within the county of Middlesex.

The account just given of the man who managed to go out of the verge into the City and Surrey and still have no fear of the bailiffs by the simple expedient of going by water catches the attention of the reader of *Amelia*, for on one occasion in the book Captain Booth does exactly what this "artful fellow" did. However, it must be admitted that before this little journey takes place, Fielding has hinted at least once that because Booth is then out on bail he is not restricted from going outside the verge. Nevertheless, in this episode the old gentleman who purports to be Dr. Harrison's friend proposes that the doctor and Booth, Amelia, and their children accompany him and his son to Vauxhall. When the excursion is undertaken, the party takes a coach to the waterside and

<sup>2</sup> Quoted by Henry B. Wheatley, *London Past and Present* (London: John Murray, 1891), III, 432.

proceeds by boat to Vauxhall, which is on the Surrey side of the Thames, outside the verge, of course, but also outside the jurisdiction of the Middlesex justices and bailiffs.

It is within the realm of possibility perhaps that Booth could have lived in the verge for the remainder of his life and have escaped arrest had he been careful not to go beyond its confines on any day except Sunday (the law provided that no arrests could be made on the Sabbath).<sup>3</sup> However, he has been living there for only about three months when one morning a footman rushes into his rooms and informs him that his wife, Amelia, who is away from home at the moment, is "taken violently ill, and carried into Mrs. Chenevix's toy-shop." This establishment is obviously outside the verge, because no sooner does Booth, hastening towards his distressed wife, cross the boundary of the district than a bailiff stops him, tells him that his wife is not really ill at the toy-shop, and that the whole affair is merely a ruse by which Booth has been enticed to leave the verge so that he can be served with a warrant for arrest at the suit of Dr. Harrison.<sup>4</sup> Booth is then conducted to the bailiff's own house in Gray's-inn-lane.<sup>5</sup>

Now that Booth has been arrested for debt, it is necessary to explain something of the law pertaining to such matters and the procedure followed by a creditor in having his debtor seized.

In eighteenth-century England there were two processes under which one could be arrested for debt. Under the first, a writ of execution, a person could be incarcerated for a debt of any amount, no matter how small, provided judgment could be obtained against him in a court of law. But it was under the second method, mesne process, that most people held for debt were confined. In this

<sup>3</sup> Once lawyer Murphy tries to enlist Sergeant Atkinson in a plan to bring Booth before the Palace Court (also known sometimes as the "Board of Green Cloth" and the "Marshall's Court") on charges of debt arising within the verge. However, the scheme does not work out, and, knowing the condition of the Court, it seems likely that Murphy would have had much difficulty in bringing an action against the captain. *Amelia*, Bk. v, Ch. iv.

<sup>4</sup> There is no way of being sure that the toy-shop used in this episode really existed; nevertheless there was a woman of the name of Chenevix who kept such a shop in Suffolk Street about the time mentioned in *Amelia*. *Vide Amelia* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, n. d.), note to II, 164.

<sup>5</sup> *Amelia*, Bk. VIII, Ch. i.



instance, under the provisions of a law passed in 1725, the debt must be equal to or in excess of forty shillings.<sup>6</sup> Then the plaintiff could have the defendant taken into custody and held pending trial. In both instances when Booth is detained for his debts, he is arrested on mesne process. In order for a creditor to have a person seized by a writ of mesne process, it was necessary that he go before a clerk of court and swear positively to the sum of money owed to him, although it was provided that a third party might appear before the clerk and swear to the belief that the debt existed. After the plaintiff's oath had been taken (or the oath of the third party), a writ for the seizure of the alleged debtor was made out by the clerk, the amount of the debt was entered on the back of the writ, and it was given to a bailiff with instructions to take the defendant into custody. After the bailiff had arrested the accused party, the latter was allowed bail, which must be provided by two substantial householders, each worth twice the amount of the debt for which suit had been brought.

In Booth's case, then, Dr. Harrison simply summons lawyer Murphy, informs him of the sum of the captain's debt, and the attorney, it is presumed, goes before a clerk of court and obtains a writ for the officer's arrest.

After Booth is taken to the house of Bondum the bailiff, Colonel James and Sergeant Atkinson appear and offer to become sureties for him so that he may be released. The implication is, clearly, that each of these soldiers is worth twice the amount of the debt involved. But the bailiff insists to the point of impudence that he have assurance that the two men are financially able to act as sureties for his prisoner. A quotation from the *House of Commons Journal* with reference to the position of a bailiff regarding his prisoners will serve to make clear Bondum's position: "A Defendant, after being arrested, is held to be in the Custody of the Sheriff, who is answerable to the Plaintiff accordingly for the Debt and Costs if

<sup>6</sup> The law was enacted "for the more effectual preventing frivolous and vexatious Arrests" and decreed "that from and after the 24th Day of June, 1726, no Person shall be held to Special Bail upon any Process issuing out of any *Superior Court*, where the Cause of Action shall not amount to the Sum of *Ten Pounds* or upwards, nor out of any *Inferior Court*, where the Cause of Action shall not amount to the Sum of *Forty Shillings* or upwards." *House of Commons Journal*, XLVII (1792), 640.

the Defendant does not appear.”<sup>7</sup> From the practical standpoint, therefore, Bondum's actions can be defended if not excused; because if he had released Booth without sufficient surety and the captain had subsequently failed to appear, the bailiff himself would have been liable for the debts involved and the costs.

As one might expect, when Fielding places the hero of *Amelia* in the power of the law, he devotes a good deal of time to the petty fees that prisoners were required to pay upon being held for debt, especially those payments exacted by the bailiff while the accused was being detained in that officer's house before being committed to jail. Also there is much said about the incivilities to which prisoners were exposed. But treatment of these topics has been given at length elsewhere and will not be included here.

Whether or not *Amelia* had any effect on public sentiment regarding prison reform would be next to impossible to determine, but the unpopularity of the book with its first readers leads to the conclusion that it had almost none. Moreover, echoes of its theme are heard in the novel genre to which it belongs even in the nineteenth century as late as the time of Charles Dickens and Benjamin Disraeli.

Although Fielding's was not the only voice of an eighteenth-century humanitarian raised in behalf of legal and prison reform, even the shocking reports of the Oglethorpe commission, created by parliament in 1729 to enquire into prison conditions, had only served to stir the public out of its apathy momentarily. Not until 1869 was the imprisoning of a person for debt made illegal in Great Britain.

JOHN C. STEPHENS, JR.

*Emory University*

#### A LETTER FROM SAMUEL RICHARDSON TO ALEXIS CLAUDE CLAIRAUT

In the years following the publication of *Clarissa*, Samuel Richardson exchanged letters with various correspondents on the Continent and took some interest in plans for translations of his works into German, French, and Dutch. A hitherto overlooked

<sup>7</sup> XLVII, 681. Bondum, as bailiff, was directly responsible to his superior officer, the sheriff, a point which he makes very plain. Bk. VIII, Ch. vi.

letter in the British Museum gives us some additional details about his communications with France in 1753.<sup>1</sup> Internal evidence shows that the recipient was the young French mathematician Alexis Claude Clairaut, who, after a visit to England, had already sent Richardson two letters. The first was dated April 6, 1753, and the following extract from it is printed in the *Catalogue of the Collection Formed by Alfred Morrison*:

When you'll see Mr Speaker I beseech you to recall me in his memory I have been extremely flatter'd of his kindness, and very sorry to have so little enjoyed the honour of his Company. Another favour I beg of you is to inform me how does Mrs Byron, as well as St Ch. Grandison I am anxious about his duel, and would fain have been his second had I known the Rendezvous.<sup>2</sup>

The letter reprinted below is presumably in reply to Clairaut's of June 7, 1753, recorded by date only in Sotheby's sale catalogue of June 25-26, 1829.

London, July 5, 1753.

Dear Sir

I cannot express the Pleasure given me by your second Letter. The first, I expected from your Politeness, and because you were so good as to promise me the Favour. But the Second flatters me with the Honour of your Esteem. "Let you know, If I remember sometimes a Man," whom every-body who had the Pleasure of knowing him that I know, not only respected, but loved?—Dear Sir, how could you ask such a Question? Indeed, Sir, I do very often remember, and speak of you with high Delight; and not without some Pride, that I had the Honour of being known to you I have even frequently regretted that we are not of one Nation; and that time of Life, and indispensable Avocations, prevent me making you a Visit to your Paris. The Cultivating of your Acquaintance and Friendship, Sir, would, were I able to visit France, be the principal Inducement.

Mr Onslow, Sir, remembers you, as you are pleased to express yourself, with great Pleasure. He commissions me to say the kindest things that you yourself would wish to hear. In truth, he greatly honours your Worth,

<sup>1</sup> I am here indebted to the kindness of Professors George Sherburn and Newman I. White, who independently called this letter to my attention. It is inserted in a remarkable grangerized set of Moore's *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron*, British Museum pressmark C.44 g, Vol XL, facing p. 396. Professor White has given some account of the autograph manuscripts inserted in these volumes (*Times Literary Supplement*, September 10, 1938, p. 584).

<sup>2</sup> N. p., 1883, i, 208. This letter is also recorded in Historical Manuscripts Commission, 9th Report, II, 478, and in Maggs Brothers' Catalogue 457 (1924), no. 2432.

and expressed himself greatly pleased that you remembered him, as one of your sincerest Friends

As to my new Piece, your kind mention of which is very flattering to my Vanity, I think to publish it at three several times; because there are some few Surprises in different Parts of it, which, were the Catastrophe known, would be lessen'd, and take off the Ardor of such Readers as should happen to approve of the Piece. But at short Distances of time—

As perhaps, in the latter end of October, or Beginning of November, The two first Volumes.

About the Middle of December, the 3<sup>d</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>.

About the Beginning of February, the 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, and 7<sup>th</sup>. (Alas! there will be Seven, tho' I have scratched out at least two in Quantity, at different Parts of the Piece).

I had an Application made to me by a Gentleman of the Name of the Abbe Prevost, for letting him have the Sheets as I printed them off. But not being determin'd about the Manner or Time of publishing, I could not oblige him. My Kinsman Leake had mentioned to me a like Request of M. Loimell; and I was sought to on the same subject by M. de Freval from the Hague, and since the Intentions of a Bookseller at Amsterdam have been made known to me to the same purpose. Mr. Leake being then, as I supposed at Paris, tho' since, he has passed into Italy, I referred the Abbe to him. But have heard no more of it from that Gentleman

Dr. Hallar [*sic*] of the University of Gottingen has also desired the same Preference, in order to translate it into German. In Ireland too Faulkner [*sic*] a Bookseller at Dublin, is treating with me to the same Purpose. I mention not these Particulars for Ostentation sake. There is no Room for that; since, none of these know a Tittle of the Merits of the Work, or whether it has any. But I know not, whether as Mr. Leake is not in France, and possibly the Abbe Prevost may have the Honour of being known to you, you may inform him of my Intentions as to Publication

Indeed, as I may mention to you, in Confidence, I think the Abbe has left out in his Translation of Clarissa, some of the most useful and pathetic Parts of the Piece; and those among us, who have read both Editions, are greatly disgusted with the French one on that Account. I knew not, that such Mutilations were allowable, except the Translation had been called an Abridgment.

In the new Piece, the Article of Religion is touched upon, a young Italian Lady, zealous in the Catholic Faith, in Love with my Hero, an English Protestant, equally stedfast in his. I shall think myself unhappy, and shall be greatly disappointed, if I have not done as much Honour to the Lady for her Zeal and Stedfastness, and that from Motives that could not be found fault with at Rome; as to the Gentleman; for to both, and to all her Friends, I give equal Piety and Goodness. In short, this Part is one of those that I value myself most upon, having been as zealous a Catholic when I was to personate the Lady, and her Catholic Friends, as a Protestant, when I was the Gentleman, and have done Credit to the Clergy of both Religions, who are good men. But how do I know, how this may be thought of in Paris, and at Rome? How happy should I have been, could I have had the Opportunity of consulting M. Clairaut on this Sub-

ject. I will only add, that a very eminent Clergyman told me, on seeing some Parts of this Management, that I should be thought by some, to be more of a Catholic than a Protestant, for that I had made as amiable a Confessor, as a Protestant Divine.

This Part, I only give Warning of Yet am told it is needless; and that no just Cause of Offence can be taken by candid Minds.

Forgive me, Sir, I am ashamed of my Length I have presumed, you see, Sir, on your kind Enquiries after my new Piece I cannot myself transcribe, or I would shorten this Letter I have only Room to repeat my Thanks for this second kind Notice of me, and to assure you of the great and sincere Respect, and Esteem, with which I am, dear Sir,

Your most faithful & obedient Serv<sup>t</sup>.

S Richardson

This letter is in a small neat hand sometimes mistaken for Richardson's, but really that of an amanuensis, probably his nephew William Richardson. "Mr. Onslow" is of course Arthur Onslow, the "Mr. Speaker" of Clairaut's earlier letter. As to Richardson's references to arrangements for publishing *Grandison* and to the Catholic theme, it need only be noted that the Dublin piracy made him abandon the plan of publishing two volumes at a time, and that his tolerant treatment of Catholicism later involved him in considerable discussion.<sup>3</sup>

The references to prospective translations call for more extended comment. On February 24, 1753, Richardson wrote to Lady Bradshaigh that he had received the German *Clarissa* from Haller, part of the Dutch translation by Stanstra, and the French translation by Prévost. He adds, "I am written to from these several translators, to furnish them with sheets as printed, of my new piece."<sup>4</sup> The above letter elaborates this statement as far as the would-be translators of *Grandison* in France are concerned. It gives the most explicit statement known to me about relations between Richardson and the famous translator of *Clarissa* and *Grandison*, the Abbé Prévost. Richardson's friend Jean Baptiste de Freval had been planning to translate *Clarissa*, but was anticipated by Prévost.<sup>5</sup> At that time Richardson offered to communicate with the French publishers of *Clarissa* through Freval.<sup>6</sup> As early as April 17, 1751,

<sup>3</sup> See W. M. Sale, Jr., *Samuel Richardson: A Bibliographical Record* (New Haven, 1936), pp. 66-67, 94-95.

<sup>4</sup> *Correspondence*, ed. Anna Laetitia Barbauld (London, 1804), vi, 245.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, v, 271-72: Richardson to Freval, January 21, 1750, O. S.

<sup>6</sup> See Alan D. McKillop, *Samuel Richardson: Printer and Novelist* (Chapel Hill, 1936), p. 269. Dottin erroneously says that Freval got Prévost to translate *Clarissa* (*Samuel Richardson* [Paris, 1931], p. 284).

Freval had asked Richardson to send him advance sheets of *Grandison*, so that he might be the first in the field with a French translation.<sup>7</sup> Richardson refers to this request, or a repetition of it, in the above letter, but he is clearly inclined to leave the field open for the present. As he wrote to Lady Bradshaigh, October 19, 1753 "I intended not, Madam, to make a pecuniary Bargain with Foreigners; having Friends at Paris, at Gottingen, in Holland, to whom I have left it to oblige any Friends of theirs, who are likely to do Justice in the Translation."<sup>8</sup>

Despite Richardson's disappointment at Prévost's *Clarissa*, he was at this stage disposed to consider an advance authorization of Prévost's *Grandison*. The continental journey of Richardson's brother-in-law James Leake, the famous bookseller of Bath, suggested the general possibility of closer ties with French booksellers and translators, a possibility that was never realized. The "Lormel" of Richardson's letter must have been of the Paris firm, La Veuve de Lormel et Fils, apparently the actual publishers of Prévost's *Clarissa*.<sup>9</sup> Lormel's request for the French rights to *Grandison*, sent to Richardson through Leake, was presumably made on Prévost's behalf, and would then be parallel to the Abbé's more direct application to Richardson, mentioned in the letter. Harris reports that Prévost asked the French authorities on March 29, 1753, for permission to publish *Grandison*.<sup>10</sup> Eventually Prévost's version appeared at Amsterdam (1755-56) without Richardson's blessing, which was reserved for the more literal but unsuccessful French version made by the Swiss clergyman Monod.

ALAN D. MCKILLOP

*The Rice Institute*

<sup>7</sup> *Correspondence*, v, 278

<sup>8</sup> McKillop, *loc. cit.*

<sup>9</sup> Henry Harris, *L'Abbé Prévost* (Paris, 1896), p. 372. Here it is said that Lormel was refused permission to publish the French version of *Clarissa* on June 17, 1740 [1750?]. The work appeared in January, 1751, with the nominal imprint of the London bookseller John Nourse. See also Dottin, *loc cit.*

<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 379-80. Harris infers that Prévost submitted the manuscript of his translation for official approval at this time, but the date seems impossibly early. Dottin (*op cit.*, p. 396) interprets this record as a request for the royal privilege based on an arrangement by which Freval, with Richardson's approval, was to furnish Prévost with advance sheets of *Grandison*. But the letter printed above shows that no such arrangement had been made.

## CHARLES CHURCHILL AND 'STATIRA'

Editors of Charles Churchill's *The Rosciad* have, from William Tooke to James Laver, been troubled by the additions and emendations which the poet made between 1761-1764 in nine editions of his poem. Serious errors in identification have resulted, and one which needs correction is the editorial misinterpretation of 'Statira.'

The ninth edition of *The Rosciad* (1764) contains two passages about 'Statira,' one directly noting the name, a second related in spirit but not using the name. Editors Tooke (1844), Hannay (1866), and Laver (1933) have agreed that in both passages the victim is Miss Pritchard (later Mrs. Palmer), daughter of the famous Hannah Pritchard. Tooke notes: "An unkind allusion to Mrs. Palmer, whose listlessness and want of animation, our author has previously animadverted on, under the name of Statira. Her mother's influence obtained for her a position at the theater far beyond her ability to sustain."<sup>1</sup> Laver, in his more recent edition of Churchill's poems, comments: "Ross's Statira was Mrs. Palmer, daughter of Mrs. Pritchard. She was a somewhat stolid actress, pushed into prominence by her mother."<sup>2</sup> Analysis of these two passages, however, fails to bear out the editor's contentions.

The first passage provides both external and internal clues to a reappraisal of 'Statira.'

Ross, (a misfortune which we often meet)  
Was fast asleep at dear Statira's feet;  
Statira, with her hero to agree,  
Stood on her feet as fast asleep as he<sup>3</sup>

The reference is to the performer's in Nathaniel Lee's play, *The Rival Queens*, but although playbills at both Drury Lane and Covent Garden show Ross as Alexander, Miss Pritchard appears only once as Statira, and then at Drury Lane to the Alexander of William Powell.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, the date of the latter performance

<sup>1</sup> Tooke, William, editor, *The Poetical Works of Charles Churchill* (London, 1844), I, 80, n. 771.

<sup>2</sup> Laver, James, editor, *The Poems of Charles Churchill* (London, 1933), I, 28, n. 629.

<sup>3</sup> Churchill, Charles, *The Rosciad* (Laver's edition), I, 28, 629-632.

<sup>4</sup> Macmillan, Dougald, *Drury Lane Calendar, 1747-1776* (Oxford, 1938), 316. The *Calendar* reveals that Ross and Miss Pritchard appeared together

is March 20, 1764, three years after Churchill's initial comment on Statira in the first edition of *The Rosciad*.

At Covent Garden, on the other hand, where the play was far more frequently revived, Ross' Alexander had for his Statira the notorious George Anne Bellamy. In her lively memoirs, she provides us with a note on one of their performances at Covent Garden: "I, as usual played Statira . . . Mr. Ross, who played Alexander, happened that night to be in one of his active dispositions, and intending to do the part justice, which was fully in his power when he did not chuse to walk over the course."<sup>5</sup> This evidence, testifying to the justice of Churchill's note that Ross did sleep through his role, more significantly adds a contender for the title of Statira: George Anne Bellamy.

The internal evidence relative to the first quotation may be stated briefly. The lines about Statira are preceded by an introductory lashing at Covent Garden audiences and players; the lines following Statira attack Macklin and Rich, both Covent Garden performers. Doubtlessly Churchill intends Statira to join the others as a Covent Garden personality. Miss Pritchard was not among the Covent Garden clique; Miss Bellamy was.

To evaluate more fully the rights of the two contenders for the title, the second passage must be quoted and analyzed.

When fear, which rank ill-nature terms conceit,  
By time and custom conquer'd, shall retreat;  
When judgment, tutor'd by experience sage,  
Shall shoot abroad, and gather strength from age;  
When Heaven, in mercy, shall the stage release  
From the dull slumbers of a still-life piece;  
When some stale flower, disgraceful to the walk,  
Which long hath hung though wither'd on the stalk,  
Shall kindly drop, then Bride shall make her way,  
And merit find a passage to the day,  
Brought into action, she at once shall raise  
Her own renown, and justify our praise.<sup>6</sup>

This passage, introducing a third figure, Miss Bride, who will be discussed later, must be distinguished sharply from the earlier

in 1756 in Addison's *Cato*, and possibly later in *The Provok'd Husband*. It is doubtful that they were a 'team'

<sup>5</sup> Bellamy, George Anne, *An Apology for the Life of George Anne Bellamy* (London, 1785), III, 62, 83.

<sup>6</sup> Churchill, *loc. cit.*, I, 35, 767-777.



lines, for unlike them, these did not appear in the first edition of *The Rosciad*, they did not, in fact, appear until 1763 in the seventh edition of the poem, an edition in which Churchill added several comments upon people he had either omitted or had not done 'justice' in the earlier versions.

Churchill's close association with Garrick had on several occasions produced a more than peremptory effect on Churchill's shafts of satire. A brief examination therefore of the relations with Garrick of both Miss Pritchard and Miss Bellamy during the years 1761-1763 may shed further light on Statira's identity. With Miss Pritchard, the task is quickly dispatched, for I find only one incident that indicates trouble: Garrick's response on March 13, 1762, to a 'letter of altercation' from Miss Pritchard.<sup>7</sup> To a conventional query about a new role and a late benefit, Garrick replies strongly that such matters depend upon the judgment of the management and are none of her business. The letter is not atypical of Garrick, but that no further correspondence on the subject exists indicates that Miss Pritchard was more tractable, less a problem child than many of her 'greenroom' associates.

Garrick's relationship with Miss Bellamy, on the other hand, is stormy. Noted generally for her independence, mischievousness, and asperity, she evidenced them fully in her relations with Garrick. Her reflections upon Garrick in her *Life* give credence to the tale. Garrick is the 'little great man' who has caused her much mortification, and upon whom she will have revenge;<sup>8</sup> he can bear no brother near the throne; and his Romeo is inferior to Spranger Barry's. True, she is writing these comments in 1785, but surely she was saying them in 1762-1763, and Churchill must have heard them or heard about them. Moreover, she committed other 'crimes' for which Churchill had vilified more talented performers: she left

<sup>7</sup> Boaden, James, *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick* (London, 1831), I, 139.

<sup>8</sup> The 'revenge' incident stems from the early '50s. Garrick had refused her a part, Constance, in *King John*. She reciprocated, via her friends, by keeping the house empty when she didn't appear, filled when she did. Her ultimate revenge came later when she refused to play a Garrick benefit in *Jane Shore*. She claims (*op. cit.*, I, 19, 123) that Garrick sent her a note: "To my soul's ideal, the beautified Ophelia," urging her to appear in exchange for a "goody, goody epilogue" he would pen for her. The letter went astray (or did Miss Bellamy send it so?), fell into the hands of a newsman, and to Garrick's chagrin, was published.

Drury Lane for Covent Garden, and she 'expatriated' herself with the Dublin group. As a candidate for Churchill's wrath, Miss Bellamy's qualifications become increasingly apparent.<sup>9</sup> But the story is not all told.

In the fall of 1761, after a long absence at Covent Garden and Dublin, Miss Bellamy reappeared briefly at Drury Lane in Hoadly's *The Suspicious Husband*. Her return must have filled Garrick with mixed emotions, perhaps even the "fear, which rank ill-nature terms conceit," preventing his "judgment, tutor'd by experience sage" from its impulse to "shoot abroad." The quotes are Churchill's; might the poet have suggested yet another thought: if this 'still-life piece' is the sleeping Statira of the earlier quotation, is she worth bringing back? Not only is this woman a 'still-life piece', she is too a

. stale flower, disgraceful to the walk  
Which long hath hung, though wither'd, on the stalk<sup>10</sup>

Churchill exhorts further that she "shall kindly drop" and make way for Miss Bride. Why?

Miss Bellamy's amours had long been notorious, particularly one with John Calcraft, several of whose children she bore. Add to this that Miss Bellamy had been on the stage since 1742 (although she claims 1733 as her birthdate), and 'disgraceful to the walk,' 'stale,' and 'wither'd' become, in light of Churchill's possible bias, understandable epithets.<sup>11</sup> The appearance of Miss Bride in the passage helps further to clarify matters. Contemporary observers thought Miss Bride, a newcomer at Drury Lane, exceedingly pretty, and Churchill, ever alert to feminine charm, joins them in extolling her beauty and talent in the eight lines immediately preceding those under discussion. The poet had on other occasions favored performers for reasons as slight as this.

<sup>9</sup> Contrast too the regular appearances of Miss Pritchard at Drury Lane from 1756-1768 with Bellamy's irregular appearances. To attribute the former fact to Mrs. Pritchard's presence as do Tooke and Laver is not wholly fair, for contemporary opinions testify to the daughter's excellence in both *Romeo and Juliet* and in *The Jealous Wife*.

<sup>10</sup> *Of*, p. 3

<sup>11</sup> In 1762, Miss Bellamy had already begun to wonder about her appearance. Her *Life*, *op. cit.*, iv, 101, makes this observation "Miss Elliott, a very beautiful young woman, and who had great talents, had got possession of all my parts in comedy . . . I had not much employment at the theater."

But Miss Bride figures in yet another way, for she seems to have been Miss Bellamy's rival with John Calcraft. Churchill's delight in such intrigues, his preference for the attractive young Bride, and as well his disgust with the aging Bellamy may well have prompted the quoted lines to urge Calcraft as well as Garrick to give the young lady an opportunity to succeed. Whether Churchill was directly responsible for the outcome is moot, but in April, 1763, the following note appears in the diary of William Hopkins, prompter at Drury Lane: "This night it was currently reported in the Green Room that Miss Bride was taken into keeping by Mr. Calcraft."<sup>12</sup> The honor is at best dubious, but to George Anne Bellamy, not to Miss Pritchard, must go the title Statira.

ARTHUR WALDHORN

*College of the City of New York*

---

#### NOTE ON A "BEOWULF" PASSAGE

745 . . . Forð near setstop,  
 nam þa mid handa higeþihtigne  
 rinc on ræste, ræhte ongean  
 feond mid folme, he onfeng hraþe  
 inwitþancum ond wið earm gesæt. . . .

In the following discussion I present what I believe is an entirely new interpretation of the crux passage which, in context, is cited above. The unsatisfactory nature of explanations given heretofore of the debated lines is sufficient index to the need for a fresh point of view.

There are two sharply divergent interpretations of "he onfeng hraþe inwitþancum." The generally accepted one, supported by Chambers and Klaeber, is to the effect that "he (Beowulf) received him (Grendel) with hostile intent," seizing Grendel's arm while still lying prone. This, however, passes too lightly over the *accepted* meaning of "inwitþancum," which, as Schücking points out in refutation, is that of "evil, malicious, or deceitful thought or purpose," a characterization hardly appropriate to the hero Beowulf. Indeed, Cosijn, Schücking, Grein, and Hoops,<sup>1</sup> alike impressed by

<sup>12</sup> This item from Hopkins' diary is quoted from Macmillan, *op. cit.*, 99.

<sup>1</sup> Kommentar (general discussion involving other views).

its obvious unsuitability to Beowulf favor the second common interpretation—that "inwitþancum" refers not to the hero but to Grendel, Grein asserting that the word is not a noun but an adjective modifying "Grendel" understood.

An objection of my own, one of a syntactical nature, to both of the above interpretations, is that making "he" stand for Beowulf involves a sudden and awkward syntactical shift of subject in a context where "se aglæca" and "fyrena hyrde," both referring to Grendel, govern all verb forms. If Beowulf were meant, it is only logical to assume that the poet would mark the change of subject by use of a phrase like "the brave one," or "the mighty one." From the standpoint of metrics, if there were a change of subject, the word "he" would logically be stressed, whereas here the "f" in "onfeng" is accented.

There is more unanimity of opinion on the words "wið earm gesæt." The common reading is "he (Beowulf) propped himself on his own arm," which, however, conveys at the best a meaning oddly vague, and unnecessary to the march of the action, which at this point is particularly rapid and tense. Indeed, used in this sense after "onfeng hraþe inwitþancum," it is a stylistic anticlimax, a weakness we should not over-hastily ascribe to our poet. A different, but not widely held, interpretation, is that of Clark-Hall and Calvin S. Brown, Jr.,<sup>2</sup> who believe (the latter makes Beowulf a proficient wrestler) that he (Beowulf) settled or sat down on (or against) Grendel's arm. Klaeber, in his *Beowulf* notes, points out the forced meaning and structurally awkward nature of this alternative interpretation. To me it does not appear probable that the author of the poem, a genuine master of language, would allow a key word like "earm" to express ambiguous reference if it were true that the arm in question were that of any other person than the subject of the sentence. Chambers, in the relevant note in his edition of *Beowulf*, cites, with apparent approval, the opinion of Grattan to the effect that this phrase, "wið earm gesæt," is really the "language of wrestling, which is employed again later in the struggle with Grendel's mother." Quoting Mr. Grattan further: "Have you never tried to throw off a bigger man than yourself who has got you down? Beowulf is at a disadvantage, having been attacked while supine. He, with great difficulty, of course, gets

<sup>2</sup> *PMLA*, LV (1940), pp. 621-7.

one shoulder up, supported on one arm" . . . etc. Just what word or passage in the poem indicates to Mr. Grattan that either Beowulf or Grendel considered this onset a wrestling match, or where it is stated or suggested that "he (Beowulf) with great *difficulty* gets one shoulder up," etc., is left uncertain. On the contrary, it seems quite evident that Grendel was not interested in keeping Beowulf pinned to the floor, as he would if wrestling, but was engaged in snatching up succulent human morsels for present and future feasting, and did not in the least suspect that Beowulf was anything but a sleeping thane. Furthermore, as to Beowulf's being at a disadvantage, we are told in the poem that the whole incident had been planned by him in advance, and certainly he would not then deliberately place himself in a position unfavorable to struggle. Rather, we must believe that the present position of Beowulf was foreseen by him as advantageous from the standpoint of both observation and actual combat.

In my opinion, the passage should be read thus: "he (Grendel) seized him (Beowulf) quickly, with evil intent, and set (or leaned) him against his (Grendel's) arm." Beowulf would thus, held loosely in the crook of Grendel's arm, be in a position for either being devoured on the spot or stuffed into Grendel's bag for carrying away. This reading would permit the subject of "onfeng" to be Grendel, as it admittedly is of all other verbs in the context, "inwifþancum" could then be used in its normal sense; and line 749<sup>b</sup> would not be weak and anti-climactic but a logical step forward in the action depicted in "forþ near ætstop, nam þa mid handa . . . ræhte ongean feond mid folme." . . . The sequence of Grendel's seizure of Beowulf may be interpreted in terms of physical action as follows.

nam þa mid [one, the right] handa higeþihtigne  
rinc on ræste, ræhte ongean  
feond mid [the other, or left] folme; he onfeng hraþe  
[that is, settled or received in his  
double grip]  
inwitþancum ond wip [the left] earm gesæt.

According to this reading, Grendel did not merely reach toward Beowulf with one hand, as previous readings would have it, but reached down and there grasped him tentatively with both. Beowulf confirms this in his report to Hygelac: (l. 2084) “ac he mægnes rof man costode, / *grapode* gearofolm,”/ and describes the pouch he

was to be slipped into, and relates that assumedly while the monster was about to lift the massive Beowulf, the hero jumped up. This act of a supposedly sleeping man possibly startled Grendel sufficiently to enable Beowulf to seize Grendel's arm while this member was still extended to full length and then to apply Calvin S. Brown, Jr.'s arm-lock. . . .

Notice that the monster is conceived of as in a great hurry (l. 740, "he gefeng hraþe"), and the descriptive adverb "hraþe" is repeated in l. 748, strongly suggesting the same subject reference. . . . Concerning the supposedly identical expression in "Christ and Satan" (ll. 430-1) . . . "aras þa anra gehwylc, and wið earm gesæt, hleonade mid handa" . . . the ingressive meaning is there clear enough, whereas in the *Beowulf* passage the interpretation universally given up to now is open to the difficulties discussed earlier in this article.

In answer to possible objections, the following remarks may be of value. The very form "gesæt," though not frequently so used, may be active in mood. Heyne's edition shows "gesittan" as an active verb in l. 634: "þa ic . . . sæbat gesæt. . . ." As to the objection that by this interpretation Beowulf is made to appear helpless in the arms of Grendel, this seeming helplessness was, according to Klaeber's note on ll. 736-8, a feature of the original story; then, too, suspense is increased by the device of this apparent set-back in the hero's struggle. It also indicates superiority of hero to monster in cunning, a familiar motif in this kind of story. . . . It may be suggested that by this reading all direct reference to the seizing of Grendel's arm by Beowulf is lost. In my opinion, the indirect statement in ll. 750-3, "sona þæt onfunde fyrena hyrde, . . . mundgripe maran" . . . , is rhetorically more effective than a direct one would be, and at the same time just as clear.

HENRY WINFRED SPLITTER

*Venice, California*

ON THE DATING OF THE *CATH MAIGE RÁTHA*

In a recent discussion of "one of the greatest of the historical cycles" of the Irish Kings,<sup>1</sup> Myles Dillon observes with good reason that the central or keystone tale of the cycle, "The Battle of Moira" (*Cath Maige Rátha*), "may date from the early tenth century."<sup>2</sup> He points out that the "first recension" of the tale<sup>3</sup> alone is of historical value and that no study of its sources and literary relations has yet been undertaken. It is clear that the folklore elements which abound in this tale and its *remscél*, the *Fled Dún na nGéd*, are more indigenously Irish than those in some of the other stories of the cycles, such as the *Aided Maele Fothartaig* (pp. 42-48). Among the interesting motifs they contain are the blinding of the king by a bee and the consequent legal judgment, the quarrel over the egg which results in a battle, the prophecy of the court fool,<sup>4</sup> the escape of the sole survivor from the battle,<sup>5</sup> the dream about the dogs,<sup>6</sup> the theft of the goose-eggs and the attendant

<sup>1</sup> *The Cycles of the Kings* (Oxford University Press, 1946), pp. 56-74. See my forthcoming review in *MLQ*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 65.

<sup>3</sup> Ed. Marstrander, *Ériu*, v, 226-47.

<sup>4</sup> The early Irish Life of St. Columba (Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, II, 497) tells how Conall Clogach was deprived of his reason. The power of foretelling the future is frequent among Irish fools and madmen. Compare the repeated prophecy (in verse) of Mael Fothartaig's *drúth* or fool (Dillon, p. 45) and the better known prophecy of King Lear's court fool or *rig-ónnmí* (*MLQ*, VII [1946], 154, 165-66); like Shakespeare's fool, the mad Suibhne prophesies his own death (see *Buile Shuibhne*, ed. O'Keeffe, p. 141, last two lines).

<sup>5</sup> *Ériu*, v, 242, lines 160-62 = *CMR*, ed. O'Donovan (Dublin, 1842), p. 320. On the "lone survivor" motif in *Beowulf* Lawrence (*Beowulf and Epic Tradition*, p. 219) remarks that it "gives every indication of being a late elaboration made in England by an Anglo-Saxon poet. It is thoroughly in the spirit of Northumbrian lyric verse of the eighth century, and, as Axel Olrik has noted, not Scandinavian in tone." The motif itself in *Beowulf* may well be of Irish origin; cf. A. S. Cook, "The Possible Begetter of the Old English *Beowulf* and *Widsith*," *Trans. Conn. Acad. of Arts and Sciences*, xxv (1922), 281 ff.

<sup>6</sup> With Domnall's dream, interpreted by his brother, compare the dream of Murchertach in the *Aided Murchertaig maic Ercá*, interpreted by his foster-brother. Each king in his fright is comforted by a woman,

curse, the transformation of dish and egg, identification of the king's son by means of a ring and a grain of gold,<sup>7</sup> and the death on Tuesday.<sup>8</sup>

The passage which is cited from the Ancient Laws of Ireland<sup>9</sup> would indicate that these tales were known to the writer of the Book of Aicill (*Lebar Aicile*), unfortunately a late text.<sup>10</sup> An even more significant statement in the Laws, not noted by Dillon, occurs in the much earlier tract on bee-judgments or *Bech Bretha*.<sup>11</sup> In spite of its occasional illegibility, an unpublished passage from MS H. 2.12 (Trinity College, Dublin)<sup>12</sup> offers in many ways a better text than the corresponding passage from H. 2.15 printed in *ALI* iv, 178, consequently I give it here.

then goes back to sleep Is the episode a variation of the motif of "the helpful animal killed by the hero's enemy" (Thompson, *Motif-Index*, B 335)?

<sup>7</sup> Not only does the "recognition by means of a grain of gold under the right shoulder" appear again, as Dillon notes, p. 41, in the Brandub story; it bears a striking resemblance to the recognition through the "kunrik" of Havelok the Dane (lines 2139-50)

'On his riht shuldre, swiþe briht,  
Brihter þan gold ageyn þe liht."

Deutschbein's view (*Studien zur Sagengeschichte Englands*, I, 134-37) that the *Havelok* is of Celtic origin is indorsed by J. D. Bruce, *Historia Meriadoci* (Gottingen, 1913), p. xxx. Is the "grain of gold" motif a Celtic variation of "the cross [or mark] between the shoulders as a sign of noble birth" which Dickson lists in *Valentine and Orson: A Study in Late Medieval Romance* (New York, 1929), p. 48 f, as "very common in the romances"?

<sup>8</sup> The similar battle of Allen (Dillon, p. 101), where Fergal and many others fell, was also fought on Tuesday (*día mairt*). See my note on Tuesday (*dies Martis*) in *MLN*, LI (1936), 317. The *mairt a Murch Rath* is referred to in one of the poems of the *Buile Shuibhne* (ed. O'Keeffe, *Ir Texts Soc.*, p. 38, line 7).

<sup>9</sup> Dillon, p. 56, from the text of the Book of Aicill, *ALI* III, 86-88.

<sup>10</sup> See D. A. Binchy, "The Linguistic and Historical Value of the Irish Law Tracts," Sir John Rhys Memorial Lecture, *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, XXXIX (1943), p. 9, note 3.

<sup>11</sup> *ALI* iv, 178, lines 10-21. *Bech Bretha* belongs to the second or middle corpus or "third" of the *Senchas Már*. See Thurneysen, *ZCP* XVI (1927), 190.

<sup>12</sup> This passage, which I transcribed twenty years ago, was overlooked by Thurneysen (cf. preceding note); see Abbott and Gwynn, *Catal. of Irish MSS in Trin. Coll. Dublin* (Dublin, 1921), p. 86. It offers the correct form of the name *Congal*, as against *Conaill* (H. 2.15).



## TEXT

[7 *mar adeir* Senc[h]us.] Masa suil ro caochad, is asuidiu<sup>13</sup> aile co crann forsin lestran uilí,<sup>14</sup> cidbe lestar dia taith<sup>15</sup> dib ar-teit a fiach ar is i cétna breth insin ceta-rugad for Congal Caoch caochsat beich. bach rí Temrach cona tabairt<sup>16</sup> asa . . .<sup>17</sup> -nus; aidbert a cin forsan fir badur beich. Noch as i breth innso breth la Ulta 7 Feine imbe, ar is do-suidiu<sup>18</sup> la conu no muca no . . .<sup>19</sup> -teit sochaide ace<sup>20</sup> n-aonfir 7 nad forfuachtadur uilí la Féne amail mart foragur la conu no mucca no cethra, no fer gonur a ucht sloig mo[1]r . . .<sup>21</sup> -a lamiter urt[h]ach for nech sunnradach díbh doranur in fer uaithibh uile. no do-rochradur uilí a ndílsi .i. conach díles a marbad itir daine 7 cethra<sup>22</sup> go tairge díged.<sup>23</sup>

## TRANSLATION

<sup>24</sup> [And as the *Senchas* says:] If it is an eye that has been blinded [by a bee], it is then that it is subject to<sup>25</sup> a lot upon all the hives: if there be a hive of those to which the lot will fall, to that one the fine belongs; for this was the first judgment that was passed on Congal Caech whom bees blinded. And the king of Tara was seek-

<sup>13</sup> a suidiudh MS.

<sup>14</sup> This reading confirms the emendation proposed by Stokes and Strachan, *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus*, I, 716 (corrige p. 23, line 20).

<sup>15</sup> tai MS

<sup>16</sup> Atkinson's conjecture ("Perhaps the word should be *co n-a tabairt ass*," Laws Glossary, p. 165, under the "vox nihili" *comidubart*) is vindicated by our passage, which offers the correct reading

<sup>17</sup> Space for 4 or 5 letters; *leg. flathemnus?*

<sup>18</sup> do suidiudh MS

<sup>19</sup> Space for about 6 letters; *leg. cethra ar-*.

<sup>20</sup> *Sic* MS. *Leg. a chinaid?* If *ace* = *fiu* (O'Dav. 105), it is barely possible that the passage means, "the many count for the value of one individual." But this interpretation, though it involves a slighter emendation of *ace*, seems less likely.

<sup>21</sup> Space for 3 letters; *leg. nocha?*

<sup>22</sup> *cethra* is barely legible in MS.

<sup>23</sup> With the gloss beginning *conach díles* compare *ALI* IV, 180, lines 9-10. With *a marbad* cf. *Ériu* V, 234, line 42.

<sup>24</sup> My translation, which is necessarily tentative, offers improvements over the untenable rendering in the printed Laws.

<sup>25</sup> *Lat.*, "it merits."

ing to deprive him<sup>26</sup> of his lordship. He laid the crime to the man to whom the bees belonged. This judgment is the judgment rendered by the Ulstermen and the Irish<sup>27</sup> concerning it, for it is in this matter concerning dogs or pigs or [cattle] that the many are responsible for the guilt of one individual, though<sup>28</sup> all have not done harm, according to Irish law, as an ox that is found with dogs or pigs or cattle, or a man who is slain at the front of a great host, risks the taking of an oath against a particular one of them, the man receives compensation from them all. Or they are all forfeited, i. e., so that it is lawful to kill them, whether men or cattle, in the establishment of right.

It is to be observed that the same confusion in epithets applied to Congal in the Annals of the Four Masters,<sup>29</sup> where he is Congal Caech in the (earlier?) verse passage and Congal Claen in the prose, is true for the two legal texts, of which the *Bech Bretha*, which refers to C. *Caech*, is centuries earlier than the *Lebar Aicle*, which refers to C. *Claen*.<sup>30</sup> This difference in epithets is one of the discrepancies that the author of the *Fled Dúin na nGéd* has attempted to iron out in his twofold explanation<sup>31</sup>, the earlier "first recension" of *CMR* knows Congal only as Congal Caech (lines 38-40).<sup>32</sup> It seems entirely possible that the "first recension," even though it is silent about Suibhne, is at least as early as the *Buile*

<sup>26</sup> Lit, "And (it) was the king of T. with his taking." On *bach*, not understood by the editors of the printed Laws, see Thurneysen, *ZCP* XIII (1921), 299-300. The form (also misunderstood by O'Davoren, no. 207, who took it for a noun) was more common than Thurneysen indicates; it appears further in the unpublished *Bretha Nemed*.

<sup>27</sup> With this version in the Laws text compare *CMR*, lines 40-44, in which strife develops between Congal of the Ulstermen and Domnall of the "Féne" when the former are not satisfied with the judgment passed by Domnall.

<sup>28</sup> Lit, "and"

<sup>29</sup> Ed. O'Donovan, I, 247 (A. D. 623). Keating (*History*, ed. Dinneen, III, 118-24) refers to Congal only as C. Claen.

<sup>30</sup> On the lateness of the Book of Aicill cf. note 10 above, also *ZCP* XVI, 189; XVIII, 356 ff.

<sup>31</sup> See *FDG*, ed. O'Donovan, pp. 34; 36; 37, footnote (k).

<sup>32</sup> *FDG* puts the story into Congal's own mouth; the explanation of Congal's epithet *Caech* in that text makes use of the familiar *fidchell* motif.

*Shuibhne*, of which one of the poems is shown by Dillon to be as early as the ninth century. As Marstrander pointed out (p. 230), the "first recension," which Dillon places in the tenth century, is an "abridgment of several older and varying accounts" no longer extant. Some conclusions may be arrived at concerning the date of the original form of the tale.

Thurneysen has made it amply clear<sup>33</sup> that the second corpus of the *Senchas Már*, including the *Bech Bretha*, is at least as early as the eighth century. Thus, if (as seems likely) the *CMR* was known to the author(s) of the law text, the tale must likewise have been known in the eighth century. The assumption that the tale was known even earlier is strengthened by the mention of the battle of Moira in Adamnán's *Life of St. Columba* written toward the end of the seventh century and preserved in a manuscript which belongs to the beginning of the eighth: *Hoc autem vaticinium temporibus nostris completum est, in bello Roth, Domnarl Brecco, nepote Aidani, sine causa vastante provinciam Domnall nepotis Ainmuireg.*<sup>34</sup>

ROLAND M. SMITH

*The University of Illinois*

---

<sup>33</sup> ZCP xvi, 167-186, *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, LV (1935), 88-90, especially "Und da ist nun zu sagen, dass diese sprachliche Altertümlichkeiten aufweisen, wie sie in keinem Sprachdenkmal des 8. Jahrhunderts jemals vorkommen, dass sie also wohl alle dem 7. angehören, wenn nicht einzelnes noch weiter hinaufgeht. Den Gebrauch der lateinischen Schrift für andere irische Texte können wir bis jetzt bis zur zweiten Hälfte des 6. Jahrhunderts hinauf verfolgen."

<sup>34</sup> J. T. Fowler, *Adamnán's Vita S. Columbae* (Oxford, 1920), Lib. III, cap. v, p. 168. On the possibility that Cumíne Ailbe, who is here "quoted" by Adamnán, wrote a "Life of Columba" before 669, see Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland*, I, 428-29, 432. In the later *Life of Columcille* (*Betha Colaim Chille*, ed. O'Kelleher and Schoepperle, pp. 246-48, 380-82) the same episode is attributed to Cumíne Fota. The confusion between C. Ailbe and C. Fota to which J. T. McNeill alludes (*Rev Celt.* L [1933], 290 f.) may be traceable to this passage; McNeill does not question the statement that C. Ailbe "was the author of a short Life of St. Columba."

It may be argued, of course, that the legal passages were based on annals, not tales, and that the tales may have been composed later. But it seems much more likely that the references in the Ancient Laws to Suibhne's frenzy and to the bee-blinding of Congal were drawn from earlier, perhaps simpler, versions of the tales we now know.

OE *EALLE ÞRÁGE*

The OE adverbial phrase *ealle þráge* (f. acc. sg.) occurs only in poetry, where in all cases it fills an off-verse. The four recorded instances are:

- |   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| (1) Ond ic wæs mid Eormenrice ealle þráge |                            |
|   | ( <i>Wids</i> 88)          |
| (2) Hé in Effesia ealle þráge             |                            |
| léode lærde                               | ( <i>Fates</i> 30)         |
| (3) éhton elðéode ealle þráge             |                            |
|   | ( <i>Jud</i> 237)          |
| (4) and þær eardedan ealle þráge          |                            |
|   | ( <i>Paris Ps.</i> ci, 25) |

There is a general disposition on the part of the dictionaries and editions to render the phrase in the very literal sense of "all the time," "always," "semper," and the like. This is, however, not right, I think, and in the case of the *Widsþ* passage in particular leads to the unlikely inference that the scop lived, or at any rate claimed to live, at Ermanaric's court during all or almost all of the latter's prodigiously long reign (d. 375 aet. 110<sup>1</sup>). Viewing the passages as a group and considering context and dictates of good sense, it would seem that the function of *ealle þráge* construed with the past tense of verbs was to express customary, continued action, indicating a movement forward in time in one continuous direction, but without implying perpetuity or foreverness. In all passages but (1), where it is construed with *wesan mid* "to stay with" (cp. ON *vera* in this sense), a rendering "kept (on)," "went on" seems most suitable. Thus.

(2) In Ephesus he kept (on), went on instructing the people. Here, as a matter of fact, one might well use "all the time," "always" in about the same sense, cp. "despite his years the king of Sweden is always (or, all the time) playing tennis," where "is always (or, all the time) playing" has virtually the force of "keeps, goes on playing."

- (3) (they) kept pursuing the foreigners.  
 (4) (they) kept on, went on living there.

In (1) one might say "I went on staying with Eormenric," but "I stayed on with Eormenric" says the same thing and is neater.

Parallels from other Old-Germanic dialects may be misleading, yet may be useful, so I venture to adduce what strikes me as a parallel in ON: *Sigurðr var þá jafnan með Regin* (Rm. 14 pr.), a sentence which I would translate "Then Sigurd stayed on with Regin" rather than "was always (*jafnan*) with Regin," a statement which would be contrary to fact. In OE one might say here: *Sigeward was mid Regine ealle þrage*.

In OE prose the idea of "keeping, going on doing something" is commonly expressed by *forþ* (cp. BT *Supplement*, 3a), comparable to Germ. *fort* (*setze deine Arbeit fort!* "keep on with your work") and *immer* (*trotz seinen Jahren spielt der König von Schweden immer Tennis* "in spite of his years the king of Sweden keeps on playing tennis, or plays tennis all the time"). In prose the idea of "for a time" "for some time" may be expressed by *þrage* or *sume þrage*. *Ealle þrage* is quite likely an old and obsolescent idiom.

F. P. MAGOUN, JR.

Harvard University

#### THE DERIVATIONS OF OLD NORSE *HOLKVIR* AND *FOLKVIR*, POETIC DESIGNATIONS FOR HORSE

1) *Holkvir*. The word *Holkvir* is recorded in the *Kálfsvísa* (*Snorra Edda*) as the name of Høgne's horse and often appears in skaldic kennings. Anne Holtsmark (*Maal og Minne* [1941], 1-10) has conclusively shown that the word *holkvir* in the kenning *holkvi hvílbeðvar* (*Akv.* 32<sup>4</sup>) has reference to the figure of a horse carved on the bed posts and therefore could not have originally meant 'ship' or 'house' (cf. the kennings *borþ-holkver* = 'ship,' *golf-holkver* = 'house'). In view of this evidence, it is unlikely that the word *holkvir* is derived from a root *\*hulk-*: *\*holk* meaning 'ship'<sup>1</sup> (cf. Swed. *holk*: ON *holka*[-*stefndr*], OE *hulc* [= Mod. Eng. *hulk*], all referring to a type of *ship*), or as designating a 'large, clumsy thing.'<sup>2</sup> Besides, the radical vowel *o* in *h-o-kvir* must be due to the *u*-umlaut of *a*, and there is no evidence that the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Erik Noreen, *Not. Norr.*, § 1916, who connects *holkvir* with OHG *holchun* 'ship', see Falk-Torp, *Norw.-Dän. etym. Wörterb.*, I, 416, *Holk* I.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Gering, *Kommentar zu den Liedern der Edda*, I, 437: "Gehört es zu norw. *holk* 'stor, klodset person'?"

vowel *a* ever occurred as an ablaut variation of *u/o* in *\*hulk-*: *\*holk-*. If *hǫlkvir* has reference to some particular characteristic of a horse, we may postulate a stem *\*hal-* (cf. Swed. *hal*: ON *háll* 'smooth') plus a *k*-suffix > *\*halk-*<sup>2</sup> (cf. Swed. *halka*: Mod. Icel. *hálka* 'smoothness, smooth road'). A form *\*halk-vir* > *hǫlkvir* could then represent a *nomen agentis* meaning 'a horse whose gait is smooth, even; one that moves evenly or gracefully,' as from a verb *\*hǫlkva* 'to move smoothly, evenly,' after the established pattern of the type *Slǫng-vir* (name of a horse) 'One who *slings* (mud, stones, etc.)' from the verb *slǫng-va* 'to sling.' The names of the horses recorded in the *Kálfsvísa* all have reference to the meritorious qualities of these steeds, which various prominent characters rode. With *Hǫlkvir* 'One whose gait is even' compare *Sleipnir* (Odin's famous horse) 'One who *slips*, moves quickly,' *Skávaðr* 'One who *lifts his legs high*' (cf. Goth. *skēwjan*), *Háfetr* 'One who *raises his feet high*,' etc., all of which have reference to the manner in which these spirited (or graceful) steeds moved. If the name *Hǫlkvir* is connected with Norw. *holk* 'stor, klodset person,' as Gering suggests (see footnote 2, above), it is difficult to see how this sense can apply to a famous steed.

2) *Fǫlkvir*. This name occurs only in the *Kálfsvísa*, and as a rime word with *Hǫlkvir* (*Hǫgn Hǫlkvi/Haraldr Fǫlkvir*). I venture to suggest that the name *Fǫlkvir* represents a derivative of the adjective *fǫlr* 'ashen grey' after the specific pattern of *Hǫlkvir*. From the adjective *fǫlr* we have in skaldic poetry the name of a horse *Fǫlski* (*Sigurðr Sturluson*, see *Lex. Poet*<sup>2</sup>, 165<sup>a</sup>), and in Mod. Icel. the horse name *Fólskvi* frequently occurs (cf. Håkon Hamre, *Maal og Minne* [1939], 175). It is well known that the influence of rime often interferes with the normal phonetic status of words, and if the form *Fǫlkvi* of the *Kálfsvísa* represents an original *\*Fǫlskva* (dat. after *reið* 'rode') or *\*Fǫlva* (weak form of the adjective *fǫlr*), either one of these two forms could have been altered to *Fǫlkvir* under the influence of rime with the form *Hǫlkvir* (cf. the rime patterns *Nǫnn/Hrǫnn*, *Vǫnd/Strǫnd*, *Slíp/Hríp* of *Grm.* 28, in which only the initial consonants vary, as in *Hǫlkvi/Fǫlkvi*). Possibly the influence of the word *falk-i* 'falcon' may also have played a part in the formation *Fǫlk-vir* since *falk-i* is a word referring to animals and may be connected with the stem

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Falk-Torp, *op. cit.*, I, 366, *Haalka*.

\**fal-w-* in *fqlr*.<sup>4</sup> The consonant *-k-* in *fal-k-* corresponded to the *k*-extension in *hql-k-vir*, and it was an easy step to add the suffix *-vir* to \**falk-*, \**falk-vir* > *fqlkvir* like *hqlkvir*. At any rate, the assumption that *Fqlkvir* represents a derivative formation from the adjective *fqlr* 'ashen grey' (whatever the origin of the elements *-k-vir* may be) is in keeping with the many color names for horses (cf. *Hrafn* 'Raven Black,' *Mór* 'Brown,' *Blakkr* 'Bright Colored,' etc.).

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

University of Kansas

### A NOTE ON COLERIDGE'S "GUTCH COMMONPLACE BOOK"

One of Coleridge's note books—the Gutch Commonplace Book—contains a puzzling paragraph on Milton which has long been tacitly considered an original composition.

The reader of Milton must be always on his duty he is surrounded with sense; it rises in every line; every word is to the purpose. There are no lazy intervals all has been considered, and demands and merits observation. If this be called obscurity, let it be remembered 'tis such a one as is com-  
plaisant to the reader not that vicious obscurity, which proceeds from a muddled head.<sup>1</sup>

The continuity of meaning here is obviously subject to suspicion. After commenting on Milton's numerous ideas and his concise presentation, the passage unexpectedly turns to a justification of the possible obscurity arising from "this." In the second place, these sentiments are noticeably unlike Coleridge's other and voluminous Miltonic criticism, in which he carefully skirts the consideration of meaning or ideas or philosophy and particularly

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Falk-Torp, *op. cit.*, I, 203, *Falk*. As Falk-Torp show, the derivation of ON *falkr* is uncertain, but there is no reason why the stem syllable *falk-* should not have been associated with \**fal-* 'ashen colored' and the bird should not have been felt as meaning 'the ashen-colored bird.'

<sup>1</sup> T. M. Raysor, ed., *Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism*, London, 1936, pp. 169-170. The paragraph was included in H. N. Coleridge, ed., *The Literary Remains of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, London, 1836, I, 184 and in A. Brandl, "S. T. Coleridge's Notizbuch aus den Jahren 1795-1798," *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, cxcvii (1896), 369. The note book is preserved in the British Museum as Add MS. 27, 901; the passage in question occupies p. 79a.

emphasizes the expression and the fine egotism of the man as found in his work.

The key to the puzzle is the fact that this passage is Coleridge's transcription of disconnected sentences from Jonathan Richardson's *Explanatory Notes and Remarks on Milton's Paradise Lost* (1734). The section in Richardson should be quoted as the basis for an example of Coleridge's method of taking notes.

a Reader of *Milton* must be Always upon Duty; he is Surrounded with Sense, it rises in every Line, every Word is to the Purpose; There are no Lazy Intervals, All has been Consider'd, and Demands, and Merits Observation Even in the Best Writers you Somtimes find Words and Sentences which hang on so Loosely you may Blow 'em off; *Milton's* are all Substance and Weight; Fewer would not have Serv'd the Turn, and More would have been Superfluous

His Silence has the Same Effect, not only that he leaves Work for the Imagination when he has Entertain'd it, and Furnish'd it with Noble Materials, but he Expresses himself So Concisely, Employs Words So Sparingly, that whoever will Possess His Ideas must Dig for them, and Oftentimes pretty far below the Surface. if This is call'd Obscurity let it be remembred 'tis Such a One as is Complaisant to the Reader, not Mistrusting his Ability, Care, Diligence, or the Candidness of his Temper; not That Vicious Obscurity which proceeds from a Muddled Inaccurate Head, not Accustomed to Clear, Well Separated and Regularly Order'd Ideas, or from want of Words and Method and Skill to Convey them to Another, from whence Always Arises Uncertainty, Ambiguity, and a Sort of a Moon-Light Prospect over a Landscape at Best not Beautiful; whereas if a Good Writer is not Understood 'tis because his Reader is Unacquainted with, or Incapable of the Subject, or will not Submit to do the Duty of a Reader, which is to Attend Carefully to what he Reads<sup>2</sup>

Richardson is in the midst of the peroration to one of his dissertations on Milton's style. After Coleridge had copied one sentence (of which he made two) with the change of a single word, he skipped two sentences which modulate to a different but connected idea. As he began to copy again, he omitted a phrase and later a word in the course of a complex sentence; and he stopped short of Richardson's hobbled fancy and of the moral admonition to the reader. The Coleridgean result might well confuse the unwary reader.

JAMES THORPE

Princeton University

---

<sup>2</sup> Pp. cxliv-cxlv In the reprint of Richardson in Helen Darbishire, ed., *The Early Lives of Milton*, London, 1932, the passage is on pp 315-316.



## HAWTHORNE AND GRISWOLD

While Hawthorne was trying to meet a deadline at Lenox, on *The House of the Seven Gables*, he wrote occasionally to his publisher, James Fields. To an inquiry as to when the novel might be completed, he replied thus, August 20, 1850:<sup>1</sup>

I can't see so far into a millstone as to tell precisely when I shall be ready with my volume. All I can say is, that I religiously seclude myself, every morning (much against my will) and remain in retirement till dinner-time, or thereabouts. But the summer is not my natural weather for work.

Then in a postscript (which apparently has never been quoted) he mentioned Rufus Wilmot Griswold, the New York editor, who had solicited a product of his pen, and asked Fields to be his agent:

P. S. Griswold has written to me about an article for a memorial which he is going to edit, for the purpose of erecting a monument to Mrs. Osgood. If you are going to New York, perhaps you will take charge of the accompanying packet for him. It is a story which I happened to have by me, intended for another purpose. He offers to pay for it, and as I did not know Mrs. Osgood, there does not seem to be much reason why I should decline payment;—so you shall be my attorney to receive whatever may be forth coming.

I am the more free to trouble you in this matter, because Griswold mentions you among the gentlemen interested in the monumental project.

P. S. 2d. You need not bother yourself about the remuneration for the story, but only hand it to Griswold, and let him pay when he is ready.

Mrs. Fanny Osgood, friend of Griswold and unwilling object of the late Edgar Allan Poe's attentions, had died a few weeks before; and the editor was preparing a memorial volume in her honor, the proceeds to buy a monument over her grave.<sup>2</sup> Fields had received a letter from Griswold,<sup>3</sup> and later wrote to inquire whether Hawthorne had been paid. Evidently he had executed his mission and felt some concern, as the money was "important to him just now."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Manuscript in the Columbia University Library.

<sup>2</sup> Joy Bayless, *Rufus Wilmot Griswold* (Nashville, 1943), p. 179.

<sup>3</sup> August 12. *Passages from the Correspondence and Other Papers of Rufus W. Griswold*, W. M. Griswold, editor (Cambridge, Mass., 1898), p. 267.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 268. Letter of November 11, 1850.

The story sold by Fields was probably "The Snow Image," which appeared in *The International Magazine* for November 1, 1850, and in the *Memorial* early in 1851. The price paid was fifty dollars.<sup>5</sup>

On December 15, 1851, answering Griswold's proposal that he write "twelve short tales," the novelist declined, but mentioned "a story which I wrote just before leaving Lenox," which he offered for a hundred dollars. This was "Feathertop," published in the *International* for February-March, 1852, and purchased at the price offered. Hawthorne had also written to Griswold when the latter was editing *Graham's Magazine* in 1843, in reply to an inquiry, offering to contribute under certain conditions.<sup>6</sup> These exchanges seem to comprise the whole correspondence between the two men.

But Griswold for years had been an ardent admirer of Hawthorne, whom he regarded as "decidedly the greatest living literary man in this country," even the "greatest, in romance, now writing the English language."<sup>7</sup> This extravagant opinion he maintained, with no substantiated change, until his death.<sup>8</sup> Just before he died, he published his mature judgment of the man whose style, he said, is "distinguished for great simplicity, purity and tranquillity," studded with "the most poetical imagery," yet "calm, chaste, and flowing, and transparent as water."<sup>9</sup>

As one reads this panegyric, one senses that, besides the fact that Hawthorne had ennobled their native region, it was Griswold's yearning for cleanliness, nobility, and spirituality in literature that had drawn him to the Puritan writer. His hatred of immorality, obscenity, and all coarseness, and his nostalgia for a heritage common with Hawthorne's impelled him to see in the artist a star, a model of emulation for all other writers.

PHILIP MARSH

*Miami University*

---

<sup>5</sup> Bayless, *op. cit.*, p. 208.

<sup>6</sup> *Passages*, p. 144. Bayless, p. 208.

<sup>7</sup> *Passages*, p. 258. Letter to Fields, Jan. 24, 1850.

<sup>8</sup> Bayless, p. 210, thinks Griswold once criticized Hawthorne's moral faculty as "morbid if not weak." But Griswold denied having written this (Bayless, p. 211)

<sup>9</sup> *The Prose Writers of America* (Philadelphia, 1856), p. 471.

## A LETTER FROM MARK TWAIN TO FRANCIS HENRY SKRINE IN LONDON

Francis Henry Skrine (1847-1933) and Mark Twain met in 1896 in India, where Skrine was a government official. When Twain was living in seclusion in London in the winter of 1896-97, writing *Following the Equator*, he dined out occasionally and privately with a few friends, including Skrine, who had returned to London.<sup>1</sup>

Five years later Mark Twain wrote from America to his English friend the following letter.

Riverdale  
on the Hudson<sup>2</sup>

Although the Sir William biography,<sup>3</sup> through the (possibly criminal) neglect of your publishers continues to not arrive, *that* doesn't prevent these Clemenses from shouting Happy New Year in the most cordial voice across the Atlantic to those well-beloved Skrines.

(over)

Jan 7/02<sup>4</sup>

[Not to be read when Mrs. Skrine is around]

What! *Kipling*<sup>5</sup> calling for Conscription? Has that immense volunteer-

<sup>1</sup> See A. B. Paine, *Mark Twain: A Biography*, II, 1039, 1045. Paine did not include any letters to Skrine in *Mark Twain's Letters*. The MS. of the letter here printed is in the National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh (Adv. ms. 7.1.19, f. 91). For permission to publish it and for a microfilm copy I am indebted to Mr. W. Park, Keeper of Manuscripts.

<sup>2</sup> Mark Twain lived in the old Appleton home at Riverdale-on-the-Hudson, just north of New York City, from October, 1901, until June, 1903. See A. B. Paine, *ibid.*, III, 1141, 1205.

<sup>3</sup> Skrine's *The Life of Sir William Wilson Hunter* appeared in 1901. For a list of his other writings and an account of his travels see *Who's Who* or *Who Was Who* for the appropriate years.

<sup>4</sup> The date appears at the bottom of the first page. The rest is on page 2. The brackets are Twain's.

<sup>5</sup> Twain and Kipling first met in 1889 at Quarry Farm, on a hill above Elmira, New York, where Twain spent many summers. Kipling, not yet widely known, was making a trip around the world and went to Elmira especially to see Mark Twain, whom he "had learned to love and admire fourteen thousand miles away." In the spring of 1893 they met again at a dinner in New York, and the two remained warm friends and mutual

rush of all ranks & conditions of patriots dwindled to such a point?—vanishing point—vanished point—since the clarion-peal of these great lines in the “Absent-Minded Beggar”<sup>6</sup> thrilled the world?

Duke's son, earl's son, son of the noovo rich,  
Bilk's son, snob's son, bastard son of a bitch,  
None of 'm whine, they *all* jine,  
Jine the cavalree,  
And hell they raise for God his praise  
In the Boer his counterree

Why, why, why! has Kipling gone to satirizing Kipling?<sup>7</sup>

D. M. McKEITHAN

*University of Texas*

---

### THOMAS J. WISE AND THE WRENN CATALOGUE

In 1920, the University of Texas acquired the library of the late Chicago banker, John Henry Wrenn, and under the editorship of the famous bibliographer Thomas J. Wise brought out the *Catalogue* in a *de luxe* edition. The present writer, who for some years had been working on William Mason, was shocked to discover the number of highly dubious attributions to Mason that the *Catalogue*

admirers. In 1903 Kipling wrote Frank Doubleday, the publisher: “I love to think of the great and godlike Clemens. He is the biggest man you have on your side of the water by a damn sight, and don't you forget it. Cervantes was a relation of his.” They were at Oxford together in June, 1907, when both received honorary degrees. In his last winter in Bermuda, Twain sometimes read aloud to groups of friends from the poetry of Kipling. See Paine, *ibid.*, II, 880-2, 964, 1006, 1087; III, 1208, 1392-5, 1440; and *Mark Twain in Eruption*, ed Bernard DeVoto, pp. 309-312.

<sup>6</sup> *The Absent-Minded Beggar*, by Kipling, was first published in the *Daily Mail*, October 31, 1899, at the beginning of the Boer War. It was promptly issued in booklet form by several publishers, and music was composed by Arthur Sullivan. It was first collected in Vol XXII of the “Bombay” Edition in 1915. See the index in E. W. Martindell's *A Bibliography of the Works of Rudyard Kipling (1881-1923)*, Enlarged Edition (London, 1923). There were different versions of the lines quoted here, and Mark Twain's version differs from the standard one. I conjecture that Kipling wrote both.

<sup>7</sup> The Boer War, which lasted nearly three years, was longer and costlier than England had expected. This explains Kipling's change of attitude with respect to conscription.

contained, and proceeded to check other, better known, authors, and on the Defoe items was fortunate in receiving the help of his friend, the late Professor W. P. Trent (with the understanding that his name be withheld at the time). In due course, the review appeared in *MLN*. for April 1922, and the reviewer sent a copy to Mr. Wise. In 1934, Carter and Pollard exposed Mr. Wise's dealings with those who relied on his advice in the purchase of bibliographical rarities;<sup>1</sup> and Mr. Wise, faced with the dilemma of appearing either ignorant or fraudulent, retired into a painful silence until his death which shortly followed. The present writer's review of 1922, however, drew from him a long letter, in which he excused himself as having had only a nominal connection with the Wrenn *Catalogue*—a strange line of defense if (as most people understand) he was Wrenn's chief adviser and even his purchasing agent. The review notes more than once the great value of many of the items listed, but the many spurious ascriptions to important authors suggest that some bookseller or agent was deliberately using this means to augment the value of many items.

The letter, written in rather difficult long hand, runs as follows:

Queen's Hotel,  
Hastings.  
May 7th 1922.

Dear Mr. Draper,

I am in receipt of the slender pamphlet containing your review of the Wrenn Catalogue, and much appreciate your courtesy and kindness in sending it. I have read the Review with close attention, and will frankly admit that I agree with your view in the main, and that I find very little to refute. As a matter of fact I had personally hardly anything to do with the compilation and construction of the volumes, and only under very considerable and prolonged pressure from Harold Wrenn and his sisters did I consent to father the work by allowing my name to appear as "Editor," and by supplying that little preface. Still my name *does* stand as Editor, and I must accordingly accept responsibility for the contents of the volume. Proofs were sent me and so far as I was able I looked over them, made many comments, and suggested a few notes. But during all those long years of war my time was fully occupied with Red Cross work, and I had but small leisure to devote to the proofs of the Wrenn Catalogue.—So much for myself.

I am not sure that you are quite fair to Harold Wrenn in the second paragraph of your review printed on p. 238. The work is not a *Bibliography*

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Carter and G. Pollard, *An Enquiry into the Nature of Certain Nineteenth Century Pamphlets*, London, 1934.

or a Catalogue of a large public library, hence it was not absolutely needful that cross-references should be given, even if Harold Wrenn had been possessed of the knowledge of how to make them. He took the books as they stood in his father's library, and catalogued them in accordance with the names of the authors in the collections of whose books he found them. Hence if a play by Colman with a Prologue by Garrick was placed by John Wrenn among his Garrick books, Harold catalogued it under *Garrick*. I don't think he deserves blame for this.

In one point I warmly support you, and that is the decrying & denouncing with the utmost vigor the abominable habit (for which however American collectors and dealers are, apparently, more to blame than their English brethren) of placing loosely 'attributed' works to various authors of repute. But on the other hand much depends upon the manner in which this is done. It is here that I must say I think you have been unjust as well as unfair in your treatment of Harold Wrenn. Harold found in (for example) the *Defoe* collection many pamphlets which I knew quite well were not by that author, but which John Wrenn had at some time or other acquired. These he catalogued as they stood. When I saw the proofs I suggested that at the commencement of the list of books by Defoe, Swift & Mason there should be placed a clear heading.

"*Books by and attributed to Daniel Defoe (&c)*. This was done. But you ignore the fact, and charge Harold with claiming certain tracts as *being by Defoe*, whereas had you been fair you would have stated plainly that the only claim made was that they had been at some time or other, and by some person or other, *attributed to Defoe*,—quite a different matter. This question of attributed books was always a bone of Contention between John Wrenn & myself. I hold (and will hold) that no book should be bound with an author's name upon its back, or placed among the works of an author, unless *at least* some reasonable evidence can be adduced to prove the right of that author to claim it. Wrenn thought otherwise, & and whenever he acquired a book in regard to which the name of one of his favorite authors had been suggested, it at once went into his collection of that author.

Here is an instance of this. One year when John Wrenn was with us, he bought from Dobell a thick volume of small 8vo. tracts, one or two of which were by Defoe, the remainder anonymous. The whole volume was lettered "*Tracts by Defoe*." This he gave to Rivière, with instructions to bind each tract separately to his usual pattern for Defoe, and added them to his Defoe collection. We had quite an argument over this, for I strongly disliked the plan. Harold of course knows nothing whatever about Books & Bibliography; and the result is that all the tracts from that old volume figure in the Wrenn Catalogue under the heading "*Books & Pamphlets by and attributed to Daniel Defoe*." But I certainly think that his heading saves the position, & and that you ought in common fairness to have drawn attention to it.

In my own Catalogue I have acted in the manner I prefer. I have only placed an anonymous book under an author's name when I can justify

this position I would gladly have sent you a copy of this catalogue, the first volume of which was issued not long ago. But every spare copy has been distributed, and I have only my own copy left. I have no doubt you will see it somewhere, as 80 copies went to America.

But all said & done,—don't you think that the Wrenn Catalogue did deserve just some small word of kindly recognition, instead of being so utterly, hopelessly, & and everlastingly damned? In the particular field he adopted, John Wrenn was very largely a pioneer. He faced a pioneer's difficulties, and could only hope to attain a pioneer's success. His collection was the first to include upon a system the books of a class of authors not yet fully appreciated, and he sought to ascertain the authorship of some at least of the mass of tracts & pamphlets of the 17th & 18th centuries. This was a big task, and no one man, starting when 3 parts of the way through life, could hope to accomplish it. But he 'did his bit' towards this end, & I do think he deserved a kindly word in return for his pains.

I fear I shall have worried you with this long scrawl. But we are mutually interested in a wide and attractive subject, the Bibliography of English Authors of repute; hence I feel that you would bear with me if I wrote you (though in great haste) to express the feelings which your review has brought into my mind.

With kindest regards,

Sinly [*sic*] yours

Thos. J. Wise

JOHN W. DRAPER

*West Virginia University*

[Miss Fannie Ratchford of the Rare Book Collections of the University of Texas, who is unusually familiar with both the Wrenn Library and the methods of Mr. Wise, has kindly made the following illuminating comments on the above letter. R. D. H.]

Paragraph one. I have the statements of both Mr. Wise and Harold Wrenn that Harold Wrenn undertook the catalogue at the persistent urging of Wise. I know from the Wise-Wrenn papers that with each book Wise sent to Chicago he sent descriptive catalogue slips. Often, when the item was a duplicate of his own copy, he sent a clipping from the proof of one of the Ashley catalogues. I have scores of such slips, printed, typed, and handwritten. It was from Mr. Wise's slips, sent with purchases, supplemented by Wise's advice, that Harold Wrenn compiled the Wrenn Catalogue. It was in press when the library came to Texas. No one here even

read the proof. A glance through Wise's list of private publications shows that in course of World War I years he issued four full-sized bibliographies and approximately fifty pamphlets, indicating that his bibliographical work held its own with the Red Cross.

Paragraph three. Wise's letters show conclusively that it was he, not John Henry Wrenn, who made the attributions Mr. Draper complained of. It is evident also that the majority of authors to whom false attributions were made were unknown to Mr. Wrenn even by name until Wise's reports of purchases acquainted him with them.

Wise's letters and Mr. Wrenn's pencilled notes on the flyleaves of the volumes based on these letters show that every book in the library attributed to Defoe, with two or three possible, but improbable, exceptions, were purchased through Wise, most of them in "lots." For instance, in May, 1904, Wise reported that he had bought for Wrenn twenty-two Defoe titles from the Birkbeck Hill estate.

The evidence contradicts Wise's statement beginning, "When I saw the proofs. . . ." There was never any bone of contention between Wise and Wrenn. Wrenn accepted without question Wise's *dicta* and suggestions.

Paragraphs three and four. Mr. Wrenn had next to nothing to do with the binding of his books. Wise, by his own reports to Wrenn, sent them to Riviere with complete instructions as to type of binding, lettering on the back, etc. He paid Riviere's bills, reported the amount to Wrenn, and received Wrenn's draft promptly, "in good order." I have scores and scores of letters illustrating Wise's complete responsibility for attributions tooled on the backs of Wrenn's books.

Paragraph six. Wise is here pleading his own case with some degree of justice. Certainly Mr. Wrenn did not "pioneer." He trusted Wise wholly in bibliographical matters, and accepted his word without question. This is not to say that I believe Wise made wrong attributions with an intent to deceive. The evidence seems to say that in some instances he was honestly mistaken and in many others he simply caught up a name that seemed possible. In no case that I recalled did he attach a high price with the supposititious name. On the contrary, the false attributions go with the most inexpensive books.



some of the thorough metrical analysis to give place for more discussion of the final unaccented *e* which is sometimes part of the stem in the case of nouns and adjectives (pp. 53-54), for more attention also to the dative *e* and, above all, to the use of the weak adjective (pp. 55 and 73). The distinction between the diphthongs *ei* and *ai* (p. 42) is dubious. In the glossary I note some errors: *anon* means "immediately" not *bientôt*, and *soone* should be glossed in the same way; *farynge*—*beste farynge* means "handsomest"; *love day* means a "day for paying debts or settling disputes"; *commune profit* needs a note or a gloss; *curious* means "painstaking," "skilfully made"; and *queynte* means "elegant," "ingeniously wrought," "complicated," "intricate." The bibliography, which among works of general criticism includes only M. Legouis's book, is severely limited. I notice two misprints: read "K. Sisam" p. 14; "Thames Street" not "Thomas" p. 17.

HOWARD R. PATCH

Smith College

---

*Call Me Ishmael.* By CHARLES OLSON. New York Reynal & Hitchcock, 1947. Pp. 119. \$2.50.

This baffling book is a mixture of background information relating to *Moby-Dick* (some of it new); conjectures (presented as fact) about the composition of the novel; and a re-doing (extending over six of the sixteen sections of the book) of Mr. Olson's "Lear and *Moby-Dick*" which appeared first in *Twice a Year* (Fall-Winter 1938). The remainder of the book, about one-third of it, sets forth Mr. Olson's contention that the Melville who wrote *Moby-Dick* could "face up to Moses" and had not yet been weakened by "any new testament world." For him Melville's writing after *Moby-Dick* represents a decline. The fault he ascribes to Melville's having become "Christ's victim." With the exception of Bartleby and Benito Cereno, the men in his stories are, according to Mr. Olson, "portraits of Jesus: 'soft, hermaphroditical Christs.'" For those who feel as Mr. Olson does about the later works of Melville the oracular statements made in these pages will be gospel. In view of the fact that Melville scholarship and criticism in recent years has found much to admire in his later work, one can surmise that Mr. Olson will not have many disciples.

To the scholar *Call Me Ishmael* will be of use because it prints notes which Melville made in his copy of Owen Chase's *Narrative of the Most Extraordinary and Distressing . . . Shipwreck of the Whale-Ship Essex*. It is not clear, because of the way Mr. Olson presents these notes, whether the whole body of them is given. There is much more here, at least, than we have had before. The book itself was presented to Melville by his father-in-law in

April 1851. It remained in the family until 1932. When it was resold in 1938, at the Cortlandt Bishop sale, a tantalizing few lines from the notes were printed in the sale-catalogue. Through the courtesy of the present owner of the book, Mr. Perc Brown, scholars now have for use about 800 more words of this important document than were available before.

In the section of his book which follows the printing of the notes in the Chase volume, Mr. Olson offers as fact what can be received only as conjecture. Puzzled by Melville's statement to R. H. Dana, on May 1, 1850 that he was then half way in his book about a whaling voyage and by Evert Duyckinck's statement to his brother in August 1850 that the new novel was "mostly done," Mr. Olson has concluded (without an "if" or a "but") that "*Moby-Dick* was two books written between February, 1850 and August, 1851." The possibility that *Moby-Dick* was replanned in the course of composition has already been offered as a conjecture by Leon Howard and Harrison Hayford. Neither tries to turn the hypothesis into fact, as Mr. Olson does. The question cannot be gone into here, but the suggestion does not seem to me to be proved, from such evidence as we now have. It will be a pity if *Call Me Ishmael* convinces its readers that it has been proved.

WILLARD THORP

Princeton University

*Homer in English Criticism: The Historical Approach in the Eighteenth Century.* By DONALD M. FOERSTER. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947. Pp. viii + 130. \$3.00.

The sub-title of Mr. Foerster's book is perhaps more indicative of the contents than the title, for a large part of the author's attention is directed not to England but to the continental critics, first French and later German. This is not meant as dispraise, but merely to indicate that it is impossible, as Mr. Foerster has seen, to separate the English attitude toward Homer from the continental. Until the appearance of Blackwell's *Enquiry* in 1735, the French critics seem more searching than the English; after Wood's *Essay* in 1775 the Germans are the most impressive. In the intervening years the Scots, largely from the national pride attached to Ossian, made the most interesting contribution to the historical approach. But throughout the century the traffic in ideas with the continent was lively and almost constant.

I find it difficult to agree that "there was no English primitivist movement in which Homer would probably be made a central figure" (p. 88). The accident of Macpherson strengthened Scottish primitivism, perhaps, but English primitivism was also an

active force. The rise of antiquarianism and of historical studies has considerable bearing on the question. One incidental suggestion is interesting:

It was commonly thought that the similarities between Homeric and Ossianic language would be more apparent if the *Iliad* had been written in prose. Critics thought that Homer would have had fewer advantages over Ossian if this had been the case. It was perhaps no coincidence that Cameron published a verse translation of *Fingal* in 1771 and Macpherson a prose translation of the *Iliad* in 1773! (p. 58 n.)

One may cavil with the author's use of one or two words. I find the colloquial use of "intriguing" annoying, and I am unable to share a contempt of "pedants." Frequently it appears that Mr. Foerster uses the second word for "scholars," and where he refers to "pedants and scholars" it is difficult to see how he distinguishes between them. In no case, so far as I noticed, was "pedant" applied to a person by name, so that the reader is left in the dark as to who are meant. All of this seems out of place in a historical study.

Mr. Foerster traces with great skill the shift from the absolute standards of the neo-classical period through the primitivism of the Scots, to the relativism of the modern historical approach. The task is not easy, because the individualism of a large number of English critics forbids easy generalization. One is impressed with the carefulness and modesty of the author throughout the book.

E. L. McADAM, JR.

New York University

---

## BRIEF MENTION

---

*Four Great American Novels.* Edited by RAYMOND W. SHORT. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1946. Pp. xlv + 573. \$2.50. Although unanimous agreement can hardly be expected on any selection of four novels for a survey course in American literature, many teachers will doubtless find Professor Short's handy edition of *The Scarlet Letter*, *Billy Budd*, *Huckleberry Finn*, and *Daisy Miller* very useful. It is a pity that Professor Short was not able to base his text of *Billy Budd* on F. B. Freeman's variorum edition (an unpublished Harvard dissertation, 1942), for Weaver's text of 1928—which he evidently followed—is often inaccurate. Matthiessen has pointed out two significant and illuminating corrections (*American Renaissance*, pp. 512 and 513; see also p. 500), and the fact adds a sting to one's regret over the casualness of Professor Short's bibliography, from which *American Renaissance* is absent. To be sure, no sensible purpose, as Professor Short says,

would be served by an uncritical list of second-rate books, but it is hard to see the usefulness of a list so arbitrarily selected as to include, for example, only Mumford's biography for Melville and, for general critical works, only Parrington's *Main Currents* and Yvor Winters's *Maule's Curse*. The volume, however, achieves its main purpose—that of making the four novels available in a pleasant format—and its value is enhanced by stimulating introductory essays on the four authors and their cultural background.

CHRISTOF WEGELIN

*Princeton University*

## CORRESPONDENCE

THE BIRTH DATE OF LORD HERBERT OF CHERBURY. In a recent article Mr D. A. Keister concludes that Lord Herbert of Cherbury was born on March 3, 1585. His chief evidence for the year is derived from *Inquisitiones Post Mortem*, which states, according to him, that Herbert "‘was eleven years, seventh months, and eleven days old on the day his father died,’" that is, on Oct. 14, 1596. Unfortunately he trusted an English translation in the *Montgomeryshire Collections*. The text of the *Inquisitiones* has fourteen (*Quatuor decem*), not eleven, for the number of Herbert's years. Consequently he must have been born on March 3, 1582, and the Oxford register, which make him fourteen in May, 1596, and whose evidence K. rejects, is quite correct. These facts are indicated in a letter of Jan. 5, 1948, from Dr. Mario M. Rossi, who brought out last year *La Vita, le opere, i tempi di Edoardo Herbert di Chirbury* (Florence, Sansoni). He writes "The document quoted on p. 392 of Vol. LXII (June, 1947) of your review reads as follows in the original (P. R. O. Inq. P. M. C. 142/249/62) 'Edwardus fuit etate Quatuor decem Annor- septem mens' et undecim dier- tempore mortis p'd Ricardū herbert pes sui.' The birth date of Edward Herbert is certainly March 3, 1582 (1581-1582) as I stated (on the basis of the very full documentation of his having come of age on March 3, 1603) in my recent book on Herbert. . . I would not like to have my readers thinking I am guilty of an inaccuracy in a book which had cost me 7 years of very conscientious work."

H. C. L.

# Modern Language Notes

---

---

Volume LXIII

MARCH, 1948

Number 3

---

---

## MOTHER HUBBERD'S APE

Virtually all agree that the account of the second court in Spenser's *Mother Hubberds Tale* contains personal satire, and that the Fox represents Lord Burghley. But who is the Ape? The late Professor Edwin A. Greenlaw decided he was Jehan de Simier, agent of the duke of Alençon, who came to England in order to promote the duke's marriage with the queen.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Harold Stein concluded that he was James VI of Scotland.<sup>2</sup> Professor Brice Harris identified him with Sir Robert Cecil, son of the great treasurer.<sup>3</sup>

In my recent life of Spenser I accepted Greenlaw's view that the Ape concerned the French marriage, though I by no means accepted all Greenlaw's conclusions.<sup>4</sup> I do not believe that the poem circulated in manuscript (except perhaps among a few of Spenser's most intimate friends), or that Leicester necessarily ever saw it, or that we should assume it occasioned Spenser's going to Ireland with Grey. Greenlaw thought that the manuscript was "called in," but Stein has clearly demonstrated that it was the printed version (1591) that was recalled from circulation. Several reviewers regret my failure to explain more fully why I prefer Greenlaw's identification of the Ape. The thoughtful discussions of Stein and Harris deserved far more attention than the brief note I accorded them. For my brevity I can offer no better excuse than a determination to cut to the bone arguments on controversial issues. I shall try to make some amends here.

<sup>1</sup> *PMLA*, xxv (1910), 535-561.

<sup>2</sup> *Studies in Spenser's Complaints*, 1934, 78-100.

<sup>3</sup> *Huntington Library Quarterly*, iv (1940-1941), 191-203.

<sup>4</sup> *Variorum Edition, Life*, pp. 68-71; 153-155.

The first half of the poem, with its general satire of the three estates, is clearly early work. Spenser says so, and his assertion goes unquestioned. But why did he send his Fox and Ape to court for a second time? Greenlaw believed that the proposed French marriage, of which Spenser, like his friend Sidney, must have bitterly disapproved, induced him to add this prediction of what would happen if the young Catholic duke became, with the council's sanction, Elizabeth's consort.<sup>5</sup>

Simier, Alençon's master of the wardrobe, arrived in London on January 5, 1579, to be followed by the duke in August. Simier charmed Elizabeth, who called him her "monkey"; and Alençon's suit progressed with every promise of success so far as Elizabeth's attitude toward her "frog," as she termed Alençon, was concerned. But the public was outraged. By the following January, 1580, Elizabeth's interest in the affair had subsided.<sup>6</sup>

In Greenlaw's opinion, as we have seen, the Ape is to be taken as Simier, or possibly a fusion of Alençon and Simier. The extreme danger in making public such a satire must, on reflection, have been evident even to so rash and impulsive a young man as Spenser. But the work was clearly a masterpiece and would be carefully preserved. When, ten years later, Burghley (as Spenser was convinced) blocked his preferment, the poem, then comparatively innocuous in so far as the French marriage was concerned, seems to have been revised for inclusion in the *Complaints*. Two passages were, I believe, interpolated at this time, lines 891-918, which describe the distress of a suitor waiting in vain for preferment at court, and lines 1137-1224, in which Burghley is harshly attacked for his shameful enriching of himself and his sons while denying soldiers, scholars, and others their proper rewards, and preventing their access to the queen. In each of these passages the difference in tone and the interruption of the flow of the narrative are evident. Readers in 1591 might very well have wondered vaguely who the Ape was, but they could have had no doubt concerning the identity of the Fox and his cubs.

Let us now consider the arguments against this hypothesis.

1. Stein and Harris both believe that the account of the second court was written in 1590. Stein emphasizes the absence of refer-

<sup>5</sup> Spenser's loathing of the scheme may apparently be read in the Bragadochio-Trompart-Belphoebe episode in *The Faerie Queene*, II, iii.

<sup>6</sup> Variorum Edition, *Life*, pp. 55-58.

ences to *Mother Hubberds Tale* earlier than 1591. To me this is an indication that the second court, like the first, was early, not late, work. The first part could have been circulated, and would probably have been mentioned with pride in the Spenser-Harvey correspondence, but not after the dangerous second part had been added.

2. Stein reminds us of Harvey's statement in 1592 that "Mother Hubbard, in heat of choller, forgetting the pure sanguine of her sweete Feary Queene, wilfully over-shott her malcontented selfe." "Harvey is so direct," says Stein, "in his placing of *Mother Hubberds Tale* after *The Faerie Queene* that by itself his statement would seem to dispose of any theory like Professor Greenlaw's. . . ." But Harvey is surely not concerned with the date of *composition* of *Mother Hubberds Tale*, but of *publication*. And it was of course published after *The Faerie Queene*.

3. Convinced that the second court was added in 1590, Stein looks for a representative for the Ape. This task he finds difficult, indeed in a sense impossible, "for there is no situation in Burghley's career which parallels that in *Mother Hubberds Tale*." He concludes that the most likely candidate is James VI, whose aspirations in the matter of the succession were well known in England at this time. But James, a Protestant and the presumptive heir to the throne, was favored by Essex and Walsingham even more than by Burghley.<sup>7</sup> There is no reason to believe that Spenser would have opposed him.

4. Harris offers two objections to the Ape as Alençon: "first, the Ape must be a genuine usurper of power, and not merely a prince consort." Yet how could Spenser and his friends know that the young prince consort might not become a power behind the throne?

5. Harris has "studied a large number of beast-satires written during the hundred years after *Mother Hubberds Tale*" without once finding a beast that represents two people. Perhaps Spenser intended the Ape for Alençon alone; or again Spenser may have been thinking merely of the French marriage, with all it implied; or caution may have prompted him to let Simier represent his master.

<sup>7</sup> Conyers Read, *Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the policy of Queen Elizabeth*, 1925, III, 339-342, Helen Georgia Stafford, *James VI of Scotland and the Throne of England*, [1940], p. 50.

6. Harris places much weight on a passage in *A Declaration of the True Causes of the Great Troubles, Presupposed to be Intended against the Realme of England* (1592). Here there is a reference to "the false fox and his crooked cubbes" in *Mother Hubberds Tale*. But is this any more than an allusion to Burghley and his sons (mentioned in ll. 1147-1158)? I see no reason to suppose that the Ape was in the author's mind.

7. "But the real key to the poem," writes Harris, "lies in the interpretation of Richard Niccols's *Beggers Ape*—a close imitation of *Mother Hubberds Tale*—written about 1607 and not published until 1627." Here the Fox represents Northampton; the Ape, Robert Cecil. Niccols, however, might very well adapt Spenser's poem to a satire on Robert Cecil without having any knowledge of Spenser's intentions many years before.

8. Harris considers the "equipment of forreine beasts" that protect the Fox and Ape to be "an obvious reference to the English spy service, which was composed chiefly of foreigners." These "warders strange," we are told, are all of "two kinds," as griffins, minotaurs, dragons, and even such amphibious creatures as the humble beaver. It would seem equally probable that we have here a description of the bodyguard or attendants that a foreign prince would bring in. In time they would seem neither English nor French but an odd mixture of the two.

9. Harris describes at length the fears that numerous persons entertained in 1590 that Burghley and his sons aimed at an almost kingly power. Spenser may have viewed the great power of Burghley and Sir Robert with apprehension, but I wonder how Spenser would have expected his readers to recognize Sir Robert Cecil in the Ape. They would surely have recognized Sir Robert as one of the Fox's cubs, especially in the lines referring to the lordships and might that almost broke the cubs' backs. As Harris says, we have here a glance at Sir Robert's deformity. But even in Spenser's loose type of allegory it would be odd for the Ape as well as the cubs to represent Sir Robert. The mere mention of the cubs would seem a hint to the reader that the Ape is some one else.

Harris remarks that it required bravery to challenge Greenlaw's widely accepted theory in regard to the Ape. That is true, but not because of the wide acceptance; rather, in my judgment, because Greenlaw's view seems to fit the facts so well. Arguments against it, on close examination, appear inconclusive.



Messrs Stein and Harris both believe that Spenser was concerned less with his pension than with the welfare of the realm under the Cecils. I am quite ready to concede that in 1579 his main concern was the welfare of the realm. But in 1590, when the danger of a Catholic prince consort was past, I am certain that his own welfare loomed large. A passage referring to Burghley in *The Ruines of Time*, coupled with the transparent allusions in lines 1137-1224 to Burghley's greed and callous indifference to the deserts of soldiers and poets, gives ground for believing that Spenser's main concern in 1590-91 was a reward that he felt was his due. Early in 1590 Spenser addressed Burghley in a dedicatory sonnet, perhaps reluctantly yet with respect. It was only after months of exasperated cooling of his heels at the English court that he launched his amazingly outspoken attack.

If we bear in mind that Greenlaw's error in regard to the "calling in" of *Mother Hubberds Tale* in no sense invalidates the theory that Spenser's concern was over the French marriage, and if we recognize that we seem to have in the account of the second court an attack on Burghley's neglect of soldiers and poets superimposed, as it were, on an earlier expression of fear for England's welfare, we perceive that the difficulties with Greenlaw's identification of the Ape vanish.

A. C. JUDSON

*Indiana University*

---

## THE TWO BROTHERS OF LERMONTOV AND PECHORIN

It is a commonplace for students of Lermontov to emphasize the autobiographical elements in his writings and especially in his dramas, for weak and strained as these often are, they deal for the most part with themes that certainly reflect to a greater or less degree the conflicts that went on between his father and his grandmother, who was trying to remove him as thoroughly as possible from his father's influence.

Yet the *Two Brothers* contains another factor of great importance in the poet's development, his love for Varvara Lopukhina, a friend of his childhood and later the wife of N. F. Bakhmetev. It is in this drama that for the first time we meet the figure of Vyera Lugovskaya, who was to give her name later to the unfinished

novel of the *Princess Ligovskaya* and also appears in the story Princess Mary in the *Hero of Our Time*. There seems little doubt that we can identify Varvara and Vyera, for we know that her marriage in 1835 called forth one of the poet's superficial sneers to cover the depth of his real feeling at the news and that within a year he had dashed off both the *Two Brothers* and the *Princess Ligovskaya* in his efforts to obtain a literary revenge and to soothe his injured feelings. This is made the more certain by his letter to S. A. Rayevsky on January 16, 1836, "I am writing the fourth act of a new drama, based on an event which happened to me in Moscow. O Moscow, Moscow, you acted very badly with me. I must explain to you first that I am in love." (Lermontov, academic edition, IV, 324). Unfortunately we do not know the details of this incident but it had apparently something to do with his call on the Bakhmetevs, when he was in Moscow on a leave of absence from his regiment around Christmas of the preceding year.

It was not at all unusual for Lermontov to rework the same theme several times, and even to incorporate long passages from earlier versions in the later. We need only to refer to the three poems, the *Confession*, *Boyar Orsha*, and *Mtsyri* for proof of this. We therefore should not be surprised if the various treatments of Vyera should show similarities and variations as the poet's mood fluctuated with time. Thus in the *Two Brothers*, Vyera, although she loves Yury, is still not technically guilty of unfaithfulness to her husband. The *Princess Ligovskaya* abruptly ends with Pechorin determined to make her unhappy. In the *Hero of Our Time* Vyera has definitely yielded to Pechorin on two separate occasions some years apart but her love for him is far more overwhelming and so in a strange way is his for her. (Of. Manning, "Lermontov and the Character of Pechorin," *MLQ.*, VII, 100 ff.)

Once we accept the autobiographical significance of much of Lermontov's work, we have no difficulty in identifying the young and enthusiastic Yury of the *Two Brothers* and the Grigory Pechorin (nicknamed George by his family) of the other two tales with certain aspects of the author. This is done very clearly by M. A. Yakovlev (*M. Yu. Lermontov kak dramaturg*, Leningrad-Moscow, 1924, p. 157 ff.) who brings out the autobiographical influences in the play and gives them equal importance with the literary borrowings from Schiller's *Die Rauber* and still more strikingly from *Die Braut von Messina*.

However, the character of Alexander Radin, the other brother, is far harder to handle. Yakovlev argues that he is drawn from the character of Aleksyey Aleksandrovich Lopukhin, the brother of Varvara, who was an apparent rival of Lermontov's for the attentions of E. A. Sushkova in 1834. He admits however that there is no question that Alexander is portrayed like A. A. Lopukhin (*op. cit.*, p. 164). In view of this admission, we may fairly ask if much of his learning and study on the question of the prototype of Alexander is not irrelevant and hazard another explanation.

In this connection it is interesting that Alexander's approach to Vyera is closely paralleled by that of Pechorin to Princess Mary in the story of that name. More than that, Lermontov has repeated in *Princess Mary* (ed. Slovo, p. 373) almost verbatim the interview between Vyera and Alexander in Act Two of the *Two Brothers* (ed. Slovo, III, 340 f.). The scene in which this occurs offers one of the keys to the character of Alexander, just as it later serves as one of the leading passages in explaining the character of Pechorin and can be compared to the latter's confession to Maxim Maximych in *Bela* (ed. Slovo, IV, 286 ff.). It is not only a question of a formal transfer of one passage to another work. It is a definite sign that Lermontov has used Alexander to incarnate certain qualities that were later to form an integral part of the complex individual that was Pechorin. We can even say without fear of contradiction that the author has presented in Alexander one side of his own personality, even though it is not the most agreeable or admirable.

From his youthful days there was a strange dualism in Lermontov. Outwardly happy and successful, he seemed to be the prey of a strange demon whom he welcomed and under whose influence he gladly fell. Side by side with poems bewailing unrequited love are others which express the deepest cynicism and the assurance that love cannot exist among mortals. It would be too long to trace out all the ramifications of these themes but we can follow them through the writings of many years. The two sides of Lermontov's character which brought him to his tragic fate exist in the two brothers.

Yury is the gay and dashing young officer, who has easily won the affections of Vyera as a young girl. He has apparently made no move during his years of military service to maintain the relationship and he feels bitterly that she has married a rich man for

whom he has himself no respect. He is frank, open and attractive both in his virtues and his vices. He promises his father that he will respect Vyera's marriage as long as she does not take the first step to reopen the affair, but he will not promise more than he can be sure of accomplishing (*op. cit.*, p. 418). In fact he takes no action until Vyera's husband, deceived by his recital of his former love for her, tells him that the wife still loves him (p. 428).

On the other hand, Alexander is far less attractive. He has lived at home with his aged father and has met with rebuffs at every attempt to win those rewards which came so easily to his brother. When for a moment he had aroused the attention of Vyera, he had reached the summit of his happiness and his whole life was absorbed, colored and warped by this apparent success, even though he was fully aware that he was only taking his brother's place. As in the unfinished novel of Vadim, the hunchback hero had turned into an incarnation of a desire for revenge, so here Alexander lived only for his brief dream of love and to renew it, there was no action too petty, to mean or too contemptible. He had become in a real sense an evil spirit for himself, for Vyera, for his brother, and even for his father. He can boast at the end, "I forced out from the heart of Vyera everything that was like virtue in it, and nothing was left for you" (*op. cit.*, p. 461) and he can sneer of his brother, "A weak soul? . . . he could not endure this" (*op. cit.*, p. 461).

We can well understand then why so much of the material used in the character of Alexander was later incorporated in that of Pechorin, who was likewise both frank and secretive, who realized very clearly that he was misjudged by all (cf. ed Slovo, iv, 405 f.) and yet could not and would not do anything to straighten his position in the eyes of society and the world. The frank sarcasm with which Lermontov greeted the marriage of Varvara could not hide from himself and his friends the depth of his feelings, the sense of betrayal by her whom he had regarded as his Madonna (cf. Anickov, "Zamyetki po rukopisyam i tvorchestvy Lermontova," *Slavia*, iv, 550 ff.). Yet his demonic spirit could not blind him to a certain responsibility for his misfortune. Perhaps some remark at the interview in Moscow after her marriage proved the inspiration for the work.

At all events in the *Two Brothers* Vyera is punished more severely than she is in the later versions. She is treated less charitably but at the same time, Yury is confronted with a rival, not the husband

but his own demonic brother. Up to this moment Lermontov, who was fully aware of the complications of his own character, had never tried to describe them. He had pictured each side of his feelings again and again. He had given tales of love and jealousy. He had represented Yury as the helpless victim of fate. Now for the first time he represented the willing tool in Alexander.

A few months later in another mood Yury was changed into Pechorin and Lermontov set himself to work out the problem on a broader scale, but he was not yet ready. Pechorin is still relatively simple, but there are germs of increasing complexity in his character. It was not until the *Hero of Our Time* that the author was ready to draw a full length picture of a hero who was at one and the same time sincere and artful, honorable and unscrupulous, a combination of opposing qualities which veiled from himself and his associates the underlying sincerity of his nature, a character who was both Yury and Alexander.

If this be the true interpretation of the *Two Brothers*, the play becomes not only a new example of the traditional literary model found so often in Schiller and elsewhere, but a recognition of the author's own spiritual problem and we are in a position to see in the two brothers and their love for one woman who has been aroused by each of them something of the doublets which were later to be developed by Dostoyevsky. Whatever its dramatic quality, it becomes more important as a source for the study of Lermontov's greatest character, Pechorin, and it explains the reason why that complex figure could retain the capacity for loving Vyera at a time when Pechorin's associates and Lermontov's critics found themselves hard pressed to give a reasonable answer.

CLARENCE A. MANNING

Columbia University

### TASSO'S ANNOTATIONS TO TRISSINO'S POETICS

In his *Notizie dei libri postillati da Torquato Tasso*,<sup>1</sup> Solerti lists:

<sup>1</sup> Angelo Solerti, *Vita di Torquato Tasso*, vol. III, Turin, Loescher, 1895. App III, pp 113, 120 See also the same author's "Notizie dei libri postillati da Torquato Tasso che si conservano nella Barberiniana di Roma," *Rivista delle biblioteche e degli archivi*, VI, 1895, 115

Trissino, *La Poetica e Il Castellano*, Vicenza, T. Ianiculo, 1529, in-fol. Esemplare tutto postillato dal Tasso presso il cardinale Valenti Gonzaga ai tempi del Serassi. Oggi non si sa dove si ritrovi. Le miscellanee del card. Valenti, da vero preziosissime, ora si conservano nella R. Bibl. Vittorio Emanuele, di Roma, ma purtroppo una mano rapace ne tolse via le più belle gemme, tra cui le prime edizioni del Trissino, chi sa che fra queste non si conservassero gli opuscoli postillati da Tasso?

It is easy to see why this volume should be of especial interest. Trissino's treatise deals with the same problems as does Tasso's dialogue *La Cavaletta, o vero de la poesia toscana*, and it frequently analyzes the same examples. Trissino was an authority often cited against Tasso during the Crusca polemic, and in Tasso's own essays on epic form Trissino's work is frequently reviewed. The *Discorsi del poema eroico* and their antecedent *Discorsi dell'arte poetica e in particolare sopra il poema eroico* contain a host of references to Trissino's works.<sup>2</sup> Tasso's letters from Sant'Anna and in the years after his release contain comments on *l'Italia liberata*,<sup>3</sup> and he carefully annotated the *Sofonisba*.<sup>4</sup> In the spring of 1585, while reading Horace's *Ars Poetica*, he made nineteen marginal notes, three of them refer to Trissino.<sup>5</sup> A Tassist like Solerti would naturally be eager to examine the comments jotted down by Tasso in the very course of reading Trissino and might well lament their loss.

It is believed that the work containing them is now in a private collection deposited in the Houghton Library of Harvard University. The Houghton volume corresponds to Solerti's description. It is in-fol. in an old Italian rebinding and contains *La Poetica di M. Giovan Giorgio Trissino* (which consists of sixty-eight folios numbered only on the recto and bears both the mark of Ptolomeo Ianiculo da Brescia and the legend *Stampata in Vicenza per Tolomeo Ianiculo, Nel MDXXIX. Di Aprile*) and the *Dialogo del Trissino intitolato il Castellano, nel quale si tratta de la lingua italiana* (which consists of twenty unnumbered folios and carries

<sup>2</sup> For example, *Discorsi di Torquato Tasso*, vol. II, Pisa, Capurro, 1823, pp. 15, 57, 59, 62, 75, 86, 88, 191, 208, 209, 217, 229, 230, 235.

<sup>3</sup> *Le lettere di Torquato Tasso a cura di Cesare Guasti*, Naples, 1857, Nos. 82, 211, 252, 434, 446.

<sup>4</sup> Franco Paglierani, *La "Sofonisba" di Giangiorgio Trissino con note di Torquato Tasso*, Bologna, Romagnoli, 1884.

<sup>5</sup> Rudolph Altrocchi, "Tasso's Holograph Annotations to Horace's *Ars Poetica*," *XLIII PMLA*, Dec. 1928, 931.

the same printer's mark as the *Poetica* but is undated). Both are heavily annotated, usually in the outer margin, but occasionally on the inner; and underscorings are frequent.

There is internal evidence that the annotations are by Tasso. At 49v., l. 11, is written: "Oltre tutte queste ballate ve n'è una di Guido Cavalcanti Ne le rime antiche ad imitazne de la quale io feci la mia Io mi sedea tutto soletto un giorno. la quale è ristretta in queste regole." The *ballata* referred to as *la mia* is one of Tasso's rhymes for Laura Peperara.<sup>6</sup>

At 26v., l. 21, opposite the quotation

Poscia, ch'amor del tutto m'ha lasciato,  
Non per mio grato,  
Che stato non havea tanto gioioso,  
Ma però, che pietoso  
Fa tanto del mio cuore,  
Che non sofferse d'ascoltar suo pianto,

occurs the postil: "Considera se nel mio dialogo sia alcun errore in persona del N cioè che questi due senari facciano i piedi de la canzona, non la fronte com'egli dice. . . ." In Tasso's dialogue *La Cavaletta* these same lines are quoted by Forestiere Napolitano<sup>7</sup> who then says: "Piacevi che questi sei primi sien fronte, o piedi? . . . Dunque volete che sia fronte? siasi: ma quelli che seguono sono tredici, nè possono esser sirima. . . ."

The apparent authorship of the annotations is confirmed by the handwriting, which has been carefully compared with published specimens<sup>8</sup> and which seems certainly to be Tasso's script.

The annotations in general show the rarity of personal comment characteristic of Tasso marginalia.<sup>9</sup> Of the postils, 401 in the *Poetica* and 69 in the *Castellano* merely repeat or summarize a passage from the text. They are not spread evenly through the volume but are grouped most heavily in the sections dealing with

<sup>6</sup> *Le rime di Torquato Tasso, a cura di Angelo Solerti*, vol. II, Bologna, Romagnoli, 1898, p. 229. The resemblance to Cavalcanti's poem is there noted, and the date of composition placed in 1563-4.

<sup>7</sup> *I Dialoghi di Torquato Tasso, a cura di Cesare Guasti*, vol. III, Florence, Le Monnier, 1859, p. 106.

<sup>8</sup> Guido Biagi e Angelo Solerti, *Manoscritti, Cimeli, e Ricordi di Torquato Tasso*, Rome, Danesi, 1897; Angelo Solerti, *Vita di Torquato Tasso, ed. cit.*, vol. I; Franco Paglierani, *op. cit.*, Rudolph Altrocchi, *op. cit.*

<sup>9</sup> Angelo Solerti, *Vita di Torquato Tasso, ed. cit.*, vol. III, p. 113.

metrics, stanza form, and rhyme, with another, lesser concentration around the treatment of words permissible in poetry.

Frequently Tasso seizes on particular words of an example cited by Trissino. Thus when the latter says (11r., l. 24),<sup>10</sup> "La mutazione poi è quando una lettera si volta in un'altra com'è fuoco, fuoco, lume, lome, despetto, dispetto", Tasso writes in the margin, "lume, lome, despetto, dispetto." Such focus on a single word is particularly striking when it occurs in bits of poetry quoted by Trissino to illustrate points wholly unconnected with problems of vocabulary. Thus, opposite Trissino's quotation (26r., l. 3)

Non vivo in disperanza,  
Anchor, che me disfidì  
La vostra disdegnanza,  
etc.

Tasso has written "disdegnanza." And opposite a stanza (37v., l. 21) containing the line

Non solo per veder meravigliando

he has jotted "meraviglo."

In one instance, by a tiny change he turns Trissino's wording into a phrase which evokes a quality peculiarly his own. Trissino remarks (*Castellano*, 4v., l. 19) that Dante though in exile, remained faithful to the Tuscan idiom "e che secondo la quiete de la sua sensualità, non era in terra loco più ameno di Fiorenza." Tasso generalizes the thought, putting in the margin "quiete de la sensualità." In this phrase there is something unmistakably Tassian, a gleam of the golden light that lies across his poetry.

The attentiveness of his reading is shown by the cross references,<sup>11</sup> by the comparison of thoughts expressed in one section with those found in another, and by substitution of exact for general statement.<sup>12</sup> Occasionally he appears to miss Trissino's point, but in general his thorough knowledge of poetics enables him to indicate refinements of, or exceptions to rules propounded by Trissino.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>10</sup> References are to the *Poetica* unless specifically marked *Castellano*.

<sup>11</sup> He employed a system of asterisks, daggers, and Roman numerals to facilitate these cross references.

<sup>12</sup> For example, when Trissino says (27r., l. 15) that there are many ("molti") kinds of *quinar*, Tasso, recalling the number given in the preceding section of the treatise, supplies the figure "cinquantadue."

<sup>13</sup> There are at least thirteen instances of this. A typical example is



To the general rule of impersonal comment there are exceptions of a certain piquancy. Thus at the close of the *Castellano* (19v., l. 24) he cries out, "Che fà in questo dialogo il Sannazaro! o che dice!"

In the *Poetica* postils there are occasional direct judgments of poetry. Of the following four lines, Tasso finds the first pair "bellissimo" and the second pair "brutissimo":

Perche sì mischia il crespò giallo, e'l verde,  
Sì bel, ch'Amor vi viene a stare a l'ombra,  
Che m'ha serrato tra piccioli colli  
Più forte assai, che la calcina pietra.<sup>14</sup>

Of Dante's lines beginning "Ch'avrà in te sì benigno riguardo," (7r, l. 15) he says, "I versi non sono splendissimi; quegli piuttosto: La gloria di colui, che tutto muove." He points out irregularities in Bembo's metrics;<sup>15</sup> and in view of his own struggle with the depiction of amorous pleasure, the comment on *piaceri amorosi* is interesting.<sup>16</sup>

The disregard of capitalization and punctuation, the obliterations, and the general style of the hand, all indicate notes made quickly

found at the bottom of 44r. Trissino writes, "La volta sarà simile à la ripresa ne la quantità, e qualità de i versi . . ." To which Tasso adds, "La volta non è sempre simile a la ripresa ne la qualità, e ne la quantità ma discorde come in quella del Petrarca Perche quel che mi trasse ad amar primà Il quale esempio è seguito dal Bembo in due ballate. Se non fosse il pensier, ch'a la mia donna et in quella Signor questa pietà che ti costrinse."

<sup>14</sup> 58v., ll. 12 ff.

<sup>15</sup> 49v., l. 11 " . . . ma considera se ne l'altre degli antichi sia parimente osservata perche Monsor Bembo esce di questa regola in due ballate l'una la mia leggiadra e candida angeletta perche la volta è diversa ne la quantità e ne la qualità de' versi da la ripresa et oltre a ciò le mutati non sono eguali et non hanno alcuno ordine. L'altra è ne gli Asolini sì Rubbella d'amor ne sì fugace se pur non vogliamo chiamar la canzone Ma canzone irregolare è quella. A quai sembianze Amor mia donna aguaglia."

<sup>16</sup> Opposite the passage (9r, l. 6) "Sono anchora altri sensi dolci, i quali alcuna volta avanzano di dolceza i sopradetti, e questi sòno il narrare quelle dilettaçioni, che a l'uso dei sentimenti nostri soavi e dolci si rappresentano . . . de le quali dilettaçioni, alcune sono inhoneste e lascivi, et altre nò," Tasso has written: "i piaceri amorosi ne la dolcezza." And a little below, at l. 32, he echoes the precept of the text, putting in the margin, "i sensi dolci voglion le parole de la purità e le petteinate"

and nervously. This impression is especially strong in telescopings<sup>17</sup> and repetitions.<sup>18</sup>

The annotations of the *Poetica* probably date from the late summer of 1587. In that year, and probably in September, Tasso at Mantua writes to Giovan Battista Lucino at Bergamo acknowledging a letter "di tre di settembre" and saying, ". . . e fate ch'io possa rivedere i dialoghi. Penso di far la giunta a quel de la Poesia toscana, perchè ho vista la Poetica del Trissino; la qual prima non aveva vista: ma mi manca la quinta o la sesta parte, la qual peravventura si dee trovare"<sup>19</sup> No evidence of the date of the *Castellano* annotations has been found. The handwriting indicates the same general period as that of the *Poetica* postils.

Apart from their bearing on the place of Trissino in the history of Tasso's thought, these annotations are of interest because they reveal the occasion of some of the changes made in the dialogue on Tuscan poetry. But they are more important as a demonstration of Tasso's intense preoccupation with the minutiae of poetic technique; and they reveal, as his essays have no occasion to do, his detailed knowledge of theoretical prosody.

EDWARD WILLIAMSON

Harvard University

### AN UNPUBLISHED TASSO SONNET

In a private collection deposited in the Houghton Library of Harvard University is a copy of the *Prose di M. Pietro Bembo nelle quali si ragiona della volgar lingua*, printed in Venice in 1525 by Giovan Tacuino. Its title page and margins are heavily annotated, and below the colophon is written a sonnet. These additions are in a hand which appears to be that of Torquato Tasso.

The volume once belonged to Rosini, the editor of the 33 volume *Opere di Torquato Tasso*, but its prior provenience cannot be traced, so that the authenticity of the postils must be established by comparison of handwriting and content with samples accepted as

<sup>17</sup> For example, 29r., l 9, where he has started to write *cord* for *concordi*.

<sup>18</sup> 56v, bottom of page. "Tre modi con quali si congiunge la base a la fronte con l'istesse rime con diverse e con parte de l'istesse e parte de l'istesse" The last word obviously should be *diverse*.

<sup>19</sup> *Le lettere di Torquato Tasso a cura di Cesare Guasti*, Naples, 1857, No. 888. The volume under consideration does lack parts five and six.

genuine. The script has been compared with numerous published reproductions of Tasso holographs.<sup>1</sup> Frequently the same word occurs in established specimens and in the material under consideration, and such coincidences afford the most dependable material for comparison by superimposing photostatic enlargements of the two samples. The peculiarities which characterize Tasso's script are present, for example, the back stroke of small case *d* in the round hand and the elevation, in the cursive hand, of the cross stroke of capital *N* so that it resembles *H*. The general character of the hand and the direction and habit of pen stroke accord with established specimens; and the quality and color of ink are what would be expected. A notable feature of the entries is that they appear to represent readings at different times and so exemplify the development of Tasso's hand, the variants of which are well marked in the collection of Biagi and Solerti.

The glosses through the body of the text show the rarity of personal comment which is characteristic of Tasso marginalia,<sup>2</sup> and this conformity of tone to previously published annotations<sup>3</sup> reinforces the testimony of the handwriting in favor of authenticity. The majority of the postils are concerned with purely linguistic questions and either repeat or summarize Bembo's remarks, although occasionally an error in the text is pointed out. The close

<sup>1</sup> Guido Biagi e Angelo Solerti, *Manoscritti, Cimeli, e Ricordi di Torquato Tasso*, Rome, Danese, 1897; Angelo Solerti, *Vita di Torquato Tasso*, vol. 1, Turin, Loescher, 1895; Franco Paglierani, *La "Sofonisba" di Giangiorgio Trissino con note di Torquato Tasso*, Bologna, Romagnoli-dall'Acqua, 1884; Rudolph Altrocchi, "Tasso's Holograph Annotations to Horace's *Ars Poetica*," XLIII, *PMLA*, Dec. 1928, 931. A point of comparison is afforded by the forgeries published by Romualdo Gentilucca, *Manoscritti inediti di Torquato Tasso*, Lucca, Giusti, 1837.

<sup>2</sup> ". . . per il modo da lui tenuto nel postillare, assai raramente le sue note svelano un pensiero o un sentimento, o danno un giudizio. Nel maggior numero dei casi Torquato non faceva che ripetere in iscritto sui margini una parola o una frase, o in breve riassumeva l'argomento di un passo allo scopo di ritrovare facilmente quel luogo." Angelo Solerti, *Vita di Torquato Tasso*, ed. cit., vol. III, p. 113.

<sup>3</sup> Paglierani, *op. cit.*; Altrocchi, *op. cit.*; Pier Desiderio Pasolini, *Il Trattato dell'Amore Humano di Flaminio Nobili con le postille autografe di Torquato Tasso*, Rome, Loescher, 1895; Enrico Celani, *Le Postille di Torquato Tasso alla Divina Commedia*, Città de Castello, Lapi, 1896.

attention with which Tasso read the treatise is indicated by the fact that its 93 folios<sup>4</sup> carry some 1200 annotations.<sup>5</sup>

For Tasso students the true interest of the volume lies in the matter written on the verso of the title page and on the colophon page. The latter is a sonnet, which, while not absolutely first class, is considerably above the level of much cinquecento amatory verse. The style is tassian, and certain phrases show affinity with portions of known Tasso lyrics.<sup>6</sup> It reads:

Gia la speranza, & l'aspettar m'annoia  
 E'l lungo stratio in che mia vita mena  
 Il fier ardor, ch'ogni dolcezza in pena  
 Mi volge, e vuol ch'inzan tempo moia  
 Men che dieci anni faticorno in Troia  
 I Greci e ogn'altra cosa il tempo affrena  
 Ma lasso il quinto lustro il sol rimena  
 Da ch'io sol vissi in angosciosa noia  
 Ne potei mai sgombrar dal petto mio  
 Quella beltà ch'ogn'hor mi fu presente,  
 Ne quel perpetuo, et immortal desio  
 Sarian le fiamme di Volcano spente  
 Co'l trapassar de sì gran tempo, et io  
 Non potei mai scemar la fiamma ardente.

The sentiment of the poem and something not unlike its allusion to inextinguishable flame occur also in the note on the back of the title page, which reads:

Dal di ch'io mirai la stupenda bellezza e le gratie di voi sola patrona della vita mia divenni all'improviso una massa de vivo et inestinguil (sic) fuoco. piu volte pensando di smoizarlo son ricorso all'assentia ma allora gli occhi miei privati dellor vivo sole continuatamente versavano come viva fontana caldissime lagrime onde appresso nella presentia contemplando la maraviglia non mai piu veduta con la affabile dolcezza sorgeno (sic) gli sfrenati et ardentissimi desiderij latrocissima gelosia l'incertezza desserf. (sic) grato fanno intorno al mio core acerbissima guerra onde assaissime volte vicinissimo alla morte mi (illegible).

The temptation is very great to consider the note connected with the sonnet, and to regard them both as autobiographical. The fact

<sup>4</sup>Numbered only on the recto.

<sup>5</sup>No way has been found to date the postils. Tasso's letters yield no clue to the time of his reading of the *Prose*

<sup>6</sup>A. Solerti, *Le Rime di Torquato Tasso*, vol. II, Bologna, 1898; Nos. 61, 63, 66, No. 89, l. 10.

is that we have no evidence of a connection, and they are written in different styles of hand, though both attributable to Tasso. Even if the note relates to the sonnet, it may be a sketch for this or a similar poem, or may be simple exegesis. Both note and sonnet would thus remain literary exercises without biographical significance. It does, however, seem safe to add them to the body of Tasso's work.

EDWARD WILLIAMSON

*Harvard University*

---

### FRENCH WOMEN MEMBERS OF THE RICOVRATI OF PADUA

Scattered through the two volumes of his *Nouvelle Pandore*, published in Paris in 1698, Guyonnet de Vertron gives much information on the Academy of the Ricovrati in Padua at the end of the XVIIth century and settles finally the question raised by Emile Magne and Bruce Morrisette in their works on Mme de Villedieu<sup>1</sup> as to whether this French novelist was actually associated with the Italian society. She is in fact listed, in unnumbered pages at the end of the second volume, as one of the deceased members. Also in an undated letter of Mme de Saliez to "Messieurs de l'Académie des Ricovrati à Padoue," reproduced in volume II, pp. 143-7, thanking them for her letters patent, one finds a reference to four other French women members: Mlle de Scudéry, Mesdames Deshoulières, Dacier and "de Ville-Dieu," "qui sont si dignes du rang que vous leur avés donné parmi vous." (p. 144)

At the end of the second volume (pp. 423-32), Vertron listed, besides himself, in the order of their reception, the French members of the Ricovrati:

1 Mlle de Scudéry, l'Universelle.

2 Mme Le Fèvre Dassier (Dacier), la Savante, noted for her erudition and her ardent defence of the ancients.

3. Mme de Salies (or Saliez) Viguière d'Alby, la Spirituelle, a provincial poetess

---

<sup>1</sup> Emile Magne, *Madame de Villedieu (Hortense des Jardins)*, 1632-1692, Paris, 1907; Bruce Archer Morrisette, *The Life and Works of Marie-Catherine Desjardins (Mme de Villedieu) 1632-1683*, Saint Louis, 1947. See also by the author of this article, *Madame de Villedieu and the Academy of the Ricovrati*, *MLN.*, LXXII (1947), 418-20.

4. la Présidente de Bretonvilliers, l'Admirable, author of unpublished *Contes, poésies sérieuses et galantes, devises*, and a *Comédie en proverbes* "il n'y a rien de plus agreable" (*Catalogue des Dames illustres mortes* in unnumbered pages at end of t II).

5. Mme Le Camus de Melson (Charlotte), l'Agréable, wife of a *conseiller d'état*. Her poetry appeared in *recueils* and journals, some in the *Histoire littéraire des femmes françaises*, Paris, 1769, 2e partie, p 122.<sup>2</sup>

6. Mlle de La Force, l'Engageante, novelist and author of fairy tales

7. Mme la comtesse de Barneville Daulnoy (d'Aulnoy), l'Eloquente, well known for her fairy tales and novels

8. Mlle Deshoulières, la Sage victorieuse, poetess in her own right, as well as her mother.

9. Mlle Bernard (Catherine) de Rouen, l'Invincible, novelist and dramatist, whose play *Brutus* was more successful when it first appeared than was Voltaire's *Brutus*.

10. Mlle Chéron (Elisabeth-Sophie), l'Excellente, who gained some distinction by her poetry and also by her engravings (cf her portrait of Mme Deshoulières); was a member of the Académie de peinture as well as of the Ricovrati, and received a pension from Louis XIV.

The following French woman and her two daughters are listed as Italian because of their residence in Padua—

1. Mme Hommez Patin, la Modeste, author of *Réflexions morales et chrétiennes*, published in 1680

2. Mlle Gabrielle (Charlotte) Patin, la Diserte; published in Latin a work on antiquities, which was admired by Bayle. It is probably to this writing that she referred in a letter to Verton (I, 398), "le grand ouvrage sur lequel elle travaille," which she promised to send to him "des qu'il sera imprimé." Bayle supposed her to be the daughter of Guy Patin; she was in fact his granddaughter.

3. Mlle Charlotte (Catherine) Patin, Rose, author of several works in Latin, one of which, an explanation of forty-one paintings found in Padua, was published in 1691, in folio

Finally Vertron lists six French women and one Italian woman as deceased members of the Ricovrati—

1. Mme Catherine de Vivonne, marquise de Rambouillet, la Lumière de Rome

2. Mme Henriette de Colligny, comtesse de La Suze, l'Immortelle, equally

<sup>2</sup> See for example her scrimmage in verse (which took place while she was still Mlle Melson) with Voiture's nephew, the libertine Pinchesne, over the relative merits of Charles Perrault's and Chapelain's odes on *la Paix* and *le Mariage du roi*, reproduced by Frédéric Lachèvre in his *Bibliographie des recueils collectifs des poésies publiées de 1597 à 1700*, Paris, 1903, III, 394-7. These poems are taken from the ms. *Recueil de rondeaux pour l'agréable maison de Viry*.

celebrated for her beauty, amorous adventures and her poetry scattered through collections of the time.

3. Mme de Chate, auparavant Mme de Villedieu, l'Inépuisable

4. Mme Anne de La Vigne, la Charmante, whose rather facile poetry was greatly lacking in verve Cf her *Ode à Mlle de Scudéry* published by Pellisson in his *Histoire de l'Académie française*, edition of 1672

5. Mme Antoinette du Ligier de La Garde Deshoulières, la Parfaite.

6. Mlle Louise Anastasie de Serment, la Philosophe. A native of Grenoble, she went early to Paris, where she became a friend of Corneille and Quinault; Vertron filled many pages of his *Nouvelle Pandore* with her poetry

7. la Signora Elena Piscopia Coinado, l'Humble, a *savante*, replaced at her death by Mme de Bretonvilliers The Ricovrati held an extraordinary session to celebrate her memory in their usual place of meeting, the "Salle des géants," also used as the Public Library of Padua (Cf a letter to Vertron by Charlotte Patin, t I, p 398).

We know, furthermore, that Saint-Aignan of the French Academy and Mlle Lhéritier, author of *l'Adroite princesse*, had membership in the Ricovrati.

One wonders why at least twenty French women of letters, against possibly only one Italian woman, and two Frenchmen were invited to membership in the Paduan academy at the end of the XVIIth century. If this honor was conferred on such noted persons as Mme Deshoulières, Mlle de Scudéry and Mme de Villedieu, others, such as Mlle de Serment and Mme de Bretonvilliers, were scarcely likely long to remain "immortelles." The reason for the unusually great popularity of French women in this Italian academy may be surmised from the fact that three belonged to the same family residing in Padua, and is actually confirmed by Vertron, who informs us that Charles Patin, the husband of Mme Hommezt Patin, recommended no less than seven persons, including his friend Vertron, in the list of eleven living French members, not counting the three of his own family. Thus he was directly responsible for the invitation to the majority of the French associates of the Ricovrati. For many years he was its president, and, as such, appears to have imposed upon the academy his desires, as Richelieu had done in the case of the young French Academy. A noted doctor in Paris and the favorite son of Guý Patin, he had been exiled from France, probably because of some disagreement with Colbert, and after sojourns in Germany and Switzerland, had settled in Padua, where he became first a professor of medicine, then chief surgeon at the University, a very lucrative and honorable post. Noted also as a numismatologist,

he published in French and in Latin numerous works on medallions in Paris, Germany and Padua, was made a knight of Saint Mark by the senate of Venice, and a member of the *Académie des curieux de la nature* at Padua as well as of the Ricovrati. As the feminine members of his family were very learned, he was apparently as ardent an advocate of women as was his friend Guyonnet de Vertron.<sup>3</sup> Living in forced exile in Italy, he was pleased to create a liaison between that country and France. We know that the influence of the erudite libertine Guy Patin extended in the first half of the century to Italian groups of free-thinkers, and now we see his son at the end of the century strengthening the relations between French and Italian literati.

MARY ELIZABETH STORER

*Beloit College*

#### RICHARD ALDINGTON'S PROPOSED "SOURCE" FOR *LA PRINCESSE DE CLÈVES*

In his introduction to a recent anthology of *Great French Romances*, including the Griffith 1777 translation of *La Princesse de Clèves*, Richard Aldington makes the startling claim to have discovered the long-sought-for and much-debated "source" of Mme de La Fayette's novel, and to have discovered it, not in some obscure story by a forgotten author, but in a place as obvious as the traditional cache of the purloined letter, namely, in Brantôme himself, long recognized as the source of Mme de La Fayette's background material. Aldington writes:

More relevant [than the prior publication of Mlle Desjardins' *Desordres de l'amour*] is a small literary fact, which appears (miraculously) to have escaped the attention of the many erudite commentators on *La Princesse de Clèves* . . . If you will look up the *Discours Septième* of the *Vie des Dames Galantes*, and read the paragraph beginning "*Je vous farray deux contes de deux femmes mariées* . . ." . . . you will find a story of a lady

---

<sup>3</sup> Vertron eloquently defended the "mérite du beau sexe" before the Academy of Arles in a series of discourses which elicited heated controversy and served to fill a large part of the first volume of his *Nouvelle Pandore*. He was an ardent advocate and member of a new "Secte des Philosophes" established by Mme de Saliez d'Alby "en faveur des Dames" She declared that, thanks to Vertron, the equality of the two sexes "ne se conteste plus parmi les honêtes Gens" (t. 1, p. 126 ff.).



who makes an "*aveu*" to her husband. It is true that M. de Brantôme jests somewhat heartlessly at her "*sotte simplicité*" and that the story ends in a far less edifying manner; but still there is the "*aveu*," and what more was needed?<sup>1</sup>

Perusal of the passage in question will, however, satisfy the judicious as to why Rudler and Chamard, as well as the editors of Brantôme, critics like Ashton, Beaunier, and Raynal, and the hundreds of cultivated readers who must have read not only his celebrated anecdotes but also *La Princesse de Clèves*, failed to establish the *rapprochement* which Aldington offers with such specious plausibility. Let us first state precisely what we mean by the *aveu*. We mean the confession by a wife to her husband of the fact that she loves another man. Aldington himself writes:

Driven pretty well out of the Maginot Line of her virtue, she [i.e., Mme de Clèves] as a last resort desperately tells her husband about her feelings, which naturally worries him a lot (This is the "*aveu*")<sup>2</sup>

Now for Brantôme's *conte*. It occurs in a series of anecdotes on the theme of incredible stupidity or naiveté in women, real or apparent, and it follows an obscene, though quite amusing, account of the cross-examination of a girl plaintiff in a case of rape. Brantôme writes:

Je vous fairay deux contes de deux femmes mariées, simples comme celle-là, ou bien rusées, ainsi qu'on voudra. Ce fut d'une bien très-grande dame que j'ay cogneu, laquelle estoit très-belle, et pour ce fort désirée. Ainsi qu'un jour un très-grand prince la requist d'amour, voire l'en sollicitoit fort, en luy promettant de très-belles et grandes conditions, tant de grandeurs que de richesses pour elle et pour son mary, tellement qu'elle, oyant telles douces tentations, y presta assez doucement l'oreille; toutes-fois du premier coup ne s'y voulut laisser aller, mais, comme simplette, nouvelle et jeune mariée, n'ayant encore bien veu son monde, vint des-couvrir le tout à son mary et luy demander avis si elle le feroit. Le mary lui respondit soudain "Nenny, ma mie. Jésus! que pensez-vous faire, et de quoy me parlez-vous? d'un infâme traict à jamais irréparable pour vous

<sup>1</sup> *Great French Romances*, Pilot Press, Duell, Sloan and Pearce, New York, 1946, p. xx. A recapitulation of the tremendously complicated problem of the sources of *La Princesse de Clèves* will be found in my *Life and Works of Marie-Catherine Desjardines (Mme de Villedieu)*, 1632-1683, Washington University Studies, 1947, pp 107-112.

<sup>2</sup> Aldington, *op cit*, p xix. We shall not discuss here what the author may mean by "driven pretty well out of the Maginot Line of her virtue," or whether any reasonable interpretation of the phrase fits the facts of the story.

et pour moy —Ha' mais, monsieur, répliqua la dame, vous serez aussi grand, et moi si grande, qu'il n'y aura rien à redire." Pour fin, le mary ne voulut dire ouy, mais la dame, qui commença à prendre cœur par après et se faire habille, ne voulut perdre ce party, et le prist avec ce prince et avec d'autres encores, et renonçant à sa sottie simplicité.<sup>3</sup>

Now, it is perfectly plain that Brantôme's heroine does *not* confess to her husband that she loves another man. Instead, she asks his advice as to whether she should accept the amorous attentions of a prince who is willing to pay her handsomely, with benefits to her husband as well! Leaving aside all considerations as to the character of such heroines as Mme de Clèves or the Marquise de Termes (in *Les Désordres de l'amour*), who struggle virtuously to repress their fatal attraction to other men, and who confess to their husbands only when the latter press them for an explanation of their strained and distant conduct, the situations are still not parallel. Brantôme's "simplette, nouvelle et jeune mariée" commits the ridiculous *blunder* of informing her husband that she has been propositioned, topping it by asking further "*si elle le feroit*." She has no "love" or "passion" to be confessed; how, then, can there be an *aveu*?

Two things more: Aldington writes that Brantôme "jests somewhat heartlessly at her '*sottie simplicité*.'" By implication, Brantôme the realist is represented as scoffing at the kind of noble confession made by the heroines of Mme de La Fayette and Mlle Desjardins. But, in the situation of the simple-minded *jeune mariée* asking her husband whether she should not accept the amorous bribes of a prurient seducer, what is there towards which one could conceivably jest "heartlessly"? Is one supposed to protest that after all, the woman was prompted by a lofty and worthy motive? Was she? And again, Aldington inserts this sly disclaimer: "It is true . . . that the story ends in a far less edifying manner." By implication, it begins in an edifying manner, quite, as it were, in the manner of *La Princesse de Clèves*. But does it? Brantôme's heroine is a mercenary, immoral *putain*. At her début in high-level prostitution, she makes a false step, an Agnès-like error in consulting what Brantôme himself calls the wrong *conseil*, but once warned, twice wary, and she quickly sees the light.

In short, Aldington has not produced the "source" of *La*

<sup>3</sup> *Œuvres complètes de Brantôme*, edited by Mérimée, Paris, Plon, 1894, XII, 40-41.

*Princesse de Clèves*, which "miraculously" escaped the attention of scholars. No doubt many readers, making no direct recourse to Brantôme, will accept his word for it that he has, so skillfully has he employed the devices of omission and implication. But there is no confession of love, Brantôme's *descouvrir*, however it is twisted, *cannot* be identified with Mme de Clèves' famous *aveu*.

BRUCE A. MORRISSETTE

Washington University

---

DE L'ESPRIT DES LOIS, BOOKS XXVI-XXXI

The last six books of *Esprit des Loix* have consistently troubled the critics. This is already clear in the analysis of D'Alembert, where the contents of Books XXVII and XXVIII are treated last, XXVI and XXIX are considered together, and XXX, XXXI are ignored completely.<sup>1</sup> Sorel felt that the work really ended at Book XXVI:<sup>2</sup>

Les livres XXVII à XXXI, tout considérables qu'ils sont en eux-mêmes, ne forment qu'un supplément consacré à un essai sur les lois romaines touchant les successions et à une histoire inachevée des lois féodales en France. A vrai dire, l'ouvrage s'arrête au livre XXVI.

Lanson, wanting to make of Books XXVII-XXXI the "temporal" division of the work, which he saw as organized according to the three categories of "laws-in-themselves," "laws in relation to space," "laws in relation to time," did not know what to do with Book XXIX, which is unfortunately a-temporal in treatment.<sup>3</sup> Later he adopted a grouping of the books somewhat more in accord with their real nature, placing XXVI and XXIX together as "Livres de théorie et de technique législatives."<sup>4</sup>

Part of the problem can be settled fairly easily, both by external and internal means. Books XXX and XXXI were composed late and were still being written while the work was on the press; indeed they were so late that Vernet complained that Montesquieu was

<sup>1</sup> Laboulaye's edition of Montesquieu, III, 79, 80.

<sup>2</sup> Albert Sorel, *Montesquieu*, 2nd ed., 1889, p. 76.

<sup>3</sup> G. Lanson, *L'Influence de la philosophie cartésienne sur la littérature française*, RMM, 1896, p. 541 and footnote 2.

<sup>4</sup> G. Lanson, *Montesquieu*, Paris, 1932, pp. 7, 8.

keeping the presses idle.<sup>5</sup> But even apart from this fact, the subject-matter of Books xxx, xxxi is quite different from that of xxvii, xxviii. The latter two were written, as we shall see, as a demonstration by example that laws as well as nations have a history. For Montesquieu's purpose, Book xxviii might just as well have dealt with laws of the Jutes or the Bantus, had he known them. Books xxx and xxxi have a quite different purpose, as their titles plainly indicate. They both begin with the term "Théorie des Loix," used for the first time in the work, and indicating a constructive rather than an analytical purpose. The first of them deals with the relationship between Frankish law and the establishment of the Frankish monarchy in Gaul, the second with the history of Frankish law in relation to the history of the French monarchy. They are, in fact, intended to state in historical terms Montesquieu's theory as to the nature and history of the French nation and its constitution. They form a sort of appendix to the work as a whole and their inclusion should be judged on that basis.

There remains the problem of Books xxvi-xxix: should the work have ended after the first of these, or should Montesquieu have grouped them differently, placing the first and the last of them together, as Lanson's second analysis suggests?

A full answer to this question would have to deal with the appropriateness of the form of *Esprit des Loix* as a whole. All that I wish to demonstrate for the moment is, that Montesquieu's grouping of the four books was intentional, that he was carrying out a preconceived plan, and that, seen from this point of view, Sorel's statement in particular is nonsense.<sup>6</sup>

Montesquieu states his plan for the work in detail toward the end of Book I, chapter 3,<sup>7</sup> establishing the categories under which he will discuss laws. He will examine them, he says, in relationship to the nature and principles of governments, to the physical nature of the country, the means of livelihood of the people, the amount of liberty the constitution will permit, local religious customs,

<sup>5</sup> Letter of Montesquieu to Cerati, 28 March, 1748, distinguishes clearly between "un morceau que je veux y mettre, qui sera un livre de l'origine et des révolutions de nos lois civiles en France"—clearly Book xxviii—and "deux livres sur les lois féodales" which are not yet finished—clearly Books xxx, xxxi. Letters of Vernet to Montesquieu, June 5, 24, 29, 1748.

<sup>6</sup> *Loc. cit.*, footnote 2

<sup>7</sup> Laboulaye ed., pp. 99, 100.

psychology of the people, their wealth, numbers, commerce, mores and manners. "Finally," he says, "laws have relationships one with another, with their origin, with the object of the legislator, with the category of things about which they are established."<sup>8</sup>

Book xxvi carries out the promises of the first and last clauses of the above sentence. It deals with the laws, "in the relationship they should have with the category of things which they regulate." In doing so, it has almost of necessity to deal with the relationship of laws one with another. Thus chapter 2 deals with the relationship of divine and human laws, chapters 3-6 of civil and natural law, chapter 19 of civil and domestic law, etc.

Books xxvii, xxviii deal with what he had called the "origin" of laws and by the word "revolutions," with which in both their titles the word "origin" is complemented, the original term and Montesquieu's historical intent are made clear. Book xxvii is a very simple demonstration. Montesquieu states what he thinks were the inheritance laws of primitive Rome, with the "reasons" for their original form and provisions.<sup>9</sup> He explains the "first" major change in them — by the Voconian law — as being the attempt to complete their effort at equality of property by restraints on the wealth of women. He explains the changes made in the code by Augustus as being prompted by the necessity, after the civil wars, of encouraging population, and so forth. He clearly feels that he has shown that changes made in Rome's inheritance laws were made in response to changing conditions, that the laws, in other words, can be explained in terms of their origins and history. Book xxviii, necessarily at much greater length, is intended to show the original complexity of law and custom in France, due to the differences in custom as between the various invading Germanic tribes and the pre-existence of laws and customs among the invaded Gallo-Romans, and to demonstrate how many of these customs and laws were lost or changed through historic events. That it is intended

<sup>8</sup> Enfin elles ont des rapports entre elles, elles en ont avec leur origine, avec l'objet du législateur, avec l'ordre des choses sur lesquelles elles sont établies.

<sup>9</sup> He explains, for example, the fact that wills were "registered" before five Roman citizens as follows:

Il y a apparence que ces cinq citoyens représentoient les cinq classes du peuple, et qu'on ne comptoit pas la sixième, composée de gens qui n'avoient rien. (Laboulaye, v, 243).

as a demonstration by example of a general law and not as a complete history, is clear from the apology for its shortness contained in its final paragraph

Il auroit fallu que je m'étendisse davantage à la fin de ce livre et qu'entrant dans de plus grands détails, j'eusse suivi tous les changements insensibles qui, depuis l'ouverture des appels, ont formé le grand corps de notre jurisprudence française. Mais j'aurois mis un grand ouvrage dans un grand ouvrage. Je suis comme cet antiquaire qui partit de son pays, arriva en Egypte, jeta un coup d'œil sur les Pyramides, et s'en retourna.<sup>10</sup>

Book xxix does not carry in its title a direct reference to the "object of the legislator," the category which, according to Montesquieu's stated plan, still needed to be discussed. It is instead, entitled, "Of the manner of composing laws," perhaps with the idea that it was also to serve as a sort of handbook for legislators and thus as a logical conclusion to the whole work. However, it does in fact do exactly what had been promised. The first two chapters state shortly the principle that the legislator should proceed in a spirit of moderation; the formalities of jurisprudence are necessary, for example, but should be kept within bounds sufficiently to prevent too great delays in justice, and no matter how desirable the purpose of the law, its penalties must not be excessive. Immediately following these two short introductory chapters, Montesquieu proceeds to discuss the laws from the point of view of the aims of the legislator: laws sometimes seem contrary to the purpose of the law-maker, when in fact they are not, but are to be explained by some particular and local situation (cap. 3): sometimes the legislator has correctly estimated the need for a reform, but has chosen the wrong method to attain his end (caps. 4, 5): a law effective in one social situation may be ineffective or destructive in another (caps. 6, 7), laws which appear the same may not have the same end in view (caps. 8, 9). This book, in other words, discusses the purposes of legislators and the way to make those purposes effective.

Let us recapitulate. Montesquieu stated his intention to conclude his work with a consideration of the laws in relation to the matters with which they deal, with a consideration of them as historical phenomena, with a consideration of them from the point of view of the purposes of the legislator. Books xxvi-xxix of his work carry out that intention, and so complete *Esprit des Loix*. It is absurd to

<sup>10</sup> Laboulaye, v, 378.

couple Books xxvi and xxix, when Montesquieu clearly states that they deal with quite different categories. It is absurd to couple Books xxvii and xxviii with xxx, xxxi, when the two former are intended as particular examples demonstrating the general rule that laws change with the changing history of their society, while the two latter are an incomplete history of the constitution of France. Critics have the right to criticise the plan of Montesquieu's work, but it is scarcely good criticism to attempt to impose one's own plan upon it.

ROGER B. OAKE

*University of Chicago*

---

### THE HEGELIAN IDEA IN *HERNANI*

David d'Angers found much "German philosophy" in Hugo's early plays, as did Alexandre Weill on returning from Germany where he had studied Hegel. M. Souriau, recounting these impressions, limits the matter to the influence of Schlegel's esthetics as known to the French poet through Madame de Stael's *De l'Allemagne*; but he is considering only the *Préface de Cromwell*.<sup>1</sup> He refers however to W. Reymond's curious study, *Corneille, Shakespeare et Goethe* (Berlin, Luderitz, 1864), which compares Hugo's poetics with the philosophy of Hegel without establishing any actual contact between them.

There is evidence in *Hernani* of the poet's having read Victor Cousin's *Cours de philosophie* (1828). The importance of Cousin is that he served as a channel of transmission to France of German idealist philosophy, notably the thought of Schelling and Hegel. Hugo's *Idée* in these well-known lines is the Hegelian Idea, the dynamic of the philosophy of history:

Qu'une idée, au besoin des temps, un jour éclore,  
Elle grandit, va, court, se mêle à toute chose,  
Se fait homme, saisit les cœurs, creuse un sillon,  
Maint roi la foule aux pieds ou lui met un bâillon;  
Mais qu'elle entre un matin à la diète, au conclave,  
Et tous les rois soudain verront l'idée esclave,  
Sur leurs têtes de rois que ses pieds courberont,  
Surgir, le globe en main ou la tiare au front.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *La Préface de Cromwell*, ed. by Maurice Souriau (Paris, Société française d'imprimerie et de librairie, 1897), p. 23 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Théâtre* (Ollendorff), i 612. The following texts are taken from the

Hugo's symbolic drama anticipates the Hegelian definition of art as "a spiritual idea represented in sensuous form,"

Only in the highest art are the Idea and the representation genuinely adequate to one another, in the sense that the outward shape given to the Idea is in itself essentially and actually the true shape, because the content of the Idea, which that shape expresses, is itself the true and real content. It is a corollary from this . . . that the Idea must be *defined* in and through itself *as concrete totality*, and thereby possess in itself the principle and standard of its particularization and determination in external appearance.<sup>3</sup>

A recent critic, examining the plays from the standpoint of Freudian psychology, gratuitously denies the presence of any conscious development, recognizing in the characters nothing more than the unconscious expression of an Oedipus complex.<sup>4</sup> In reality, thought and expression denote in Hugo

eighth and tenth lectures of Cousin's course, given on 12 June and 26 June 1828 respectively. "Le monde des idées est caché dans le monde des faits. Les faits en eux-mêmes et par leur côté extérieur sont insignifiants, mais, fécondés par la raison, ils manifestent l'idée qu'ils enveloppent, deviennent raisonnables, intelligibles. . . . Sans doute on fait très bien de recueillir les faits comme ils se passent; mais ce sont là plutôt des matériaux pour l'histoire que l'histoire elle-même. L'histoire proprement dite, l'histoire par excellence . . . ne se trouve que dans le rapport des faits aux idées. Le premier devoir de l'historien philosophe est donc de demander aux faits ce qu'ils signifient, l'idée qu'ils expriment. . . . Rappeler tout fait, même le plus particulier, à sa loi générale . . . , examiner son rapport avec les autres faits élevés aussi à leur loi, et de rapports en rapports arriver jusqu'à saisir celui de la particularité la plus fugitive à l'idée la plus générale d'une époque, c'est là la règle éminente de l'histoire."—"Un grand homme . . . vient pour représenter une idée, telle idée et non pas telle autre, tant que cette idée a de la force et vaut la peine d'être représentée, pas avant, pas après. La conséquence est qu'un grand homme paraît quand il doit paraître, qu'il disparaît quand il n'a plus rien à faire, qu'il naît et qu'il meurt à propos. . . . Un grand homme n'est pas un individu . . . ; sa fortune est de représenter mieux qu'aucun autre homme de son temps les idées de ce temps, ses intérêts, ses besoins." *Cours de philosophie* (Paris, Pichon et Didier, 1828), pp. 12-13, pp. 15-19.

<sup>3</sup> Preface to *Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik* (1835-38) *The Introduction to Hegel's Philosophy of Fine Art*, trans. by Bosanquet (London, Kegan Paul, 1905), p. 179.

<sup>4</sup> Hermann Hugé in Grenchen, *Les Dramas de V. Hugo expliqués par la psychanalyse* (Solothurn, 1930). Charles Baudouin, *Psychanalyse de Victor Hugo* (Geneva, 1943), considers the plays as the expression of a transcendental idealism.



un être

Intelligent, qui court droit au but qu'il rêva

Analysis of the monologue from which our text is taken (*Hernani*, iv 2), with its sequel at the conclusion of the act (iv 5), reveals the dialectical pattern: *Thesis*, Power; *Antithesis*, Weakness; *Synthesis*, Mercy. The prelude is a philosophy of history. Symbolically, the French poet views the structure of the imperial "edifice" as a *pyramid*, whose apex is a synthesis of liberty (the elective principle) and of authority.

De là vient l'équilibre, et toujours l'ordre éclate

The whole scene is orchestrated with the same counterpoint.<sup>5</sup> In its rhetoric dialectical value attaches to two figures which occur with great frequency: antithesis and climax. The imagery realizes that union of the finite and the infinite in phenomenal representation of an absolute ideal which, according to Hegel, is the definition of art. The ternary rhythm of the Romantic Alexandrine too has an unconscious relation to the logical pattern of XIXth century idealist thought. It is the organic principle, complementary to the dynamic *enjambement* at work breaking down the traditional forms. The language is a creative synthesis of realism and poetry, and many are the passages in which the symphonic harmony of the verse "identifies" itself with the rhythm and with the expressive qualities of the words.<sup>6</sup> The esthetic principle in Hugo is total. *Hernani* is a "Gesamtkunstwerk," breathing the whole spirit of the Romantic Age.

D. O. EVANS

*The University of British Columbia*

---

<sup>5</sup> Lines 1461-92: Power, 1493-1510: Weakness—1510-22: Power; 1523-60: Weakness. How fundamentally romantic is this opposition is brought out by Jacques Barzun in *Romanticism and the Modern Ego* (Boston, Little, Brown, 1944), p. 70.

<sup>6</sup> F. Brunot, "Les Romantiques et la langue poétique," in *Le Romantisme et les Lettres* (Editions Montaigne, 1929), Chapter I.

## JULIEN BENDA AND HUGUES REBELL

It is a notable fact that Julien Benda, who is today one of France's foremost theorists of democracy, began his literary career as anything but a democrat. His first book, *Dialogues à Byzance* (1900), composed in large part of articles he had written on the Dreyfus Case for *La Revue blanche*, contains a strong current of Nietzschean contempt for the forms and principles of democracy, a contempt which is most evident in the 'dialogue' entitled *La Revanche du riche*. The theory he advances here is a watered-down version of the Superman idea, in which M. Benda divides all of humanity into two classes, constituted by hereditary and biological factors and fated to hostility in their struggle for social domination. These two classes are the 'aptes au bonheur' (defined here as the satisfaction of desires and needs) and the 'inaptes.' The former are the free, and happy, the strong, the healthy, the intelligent of the world; the 'inaptes' are the serfs, the weak, the unhappy, the stupid, the suffering—the great majority of mankind. To disarm and dominate their betters these serfs have invented humanitarianism and Christianity, the refuge of the disinherited, and are in a fair way to impose on the world their 'prejudice' that no man is responsible for his own miseries. They cannot know liberty, for its concept is beyond them; all they know is a degrading equality. They are jealous of wealth, never realizing that money alone makes the economic wheels turn; and they would level all fortunes should they be fortunate enough to win the old struggle for power. They hate life, are pessimists, Christians, while the 'aptes' are lovers of the cordial of existence, pagans, optimists. It is particularly since 1789 that the values and ideas of the 'inaptes' have triumphed in Europe; the 'flot souffreteux' is about to engulf the world.

If the rise of the 'suffering' to the final domination of society is to be prevented, then the representatives of human nobility in all its forms must band together in a coalition for patrician defense. The aristocracies of money, of birth and of intellect—the three great classes of the 'aptes'—must form a union if they would continue their existence in the stagnant atmosphere of democracy. This union would be a natural product of the essential nature of the man of wealth, the man of wit and the man of title, for all these representatives of human superiority share the authoritarian spirit

and all are born opponents of the monotonous sameness of the democratic régime. Certain practical obstacles, of course, present themselves to any such coalition and it is not probable that Europe will soon see the symbolic trio Duclaux-Reinach-Hervé de Kérouhant. But

. . . quels que soient les noms des mandataires et la date de la signature, il se conclura nécessairement, le traité d'alliance entre les trois expressions de la force l'argent, la raison et l'esprit d'autorité Ce jour-là, l'invasion chrétienne pourra considérer que ses progrès sont gravement compromis, et que le monde appartient de nouveau à l'idéal des aptes au bonheur. Ce jour-là, la Révolution—au lieu de nous apparaître comme une opération de chirurgie sociale douloureuse, stérile et décevante, substituant à un régime assurément inique un état de stagnation définitif et imperfectible—nous apparaîtra comme la plus bienfaisante des convulsions humaines, puisqu'elle aura déterminé la secousse féconde, celle qui, détruisant l'antique superposition des individus et les soumettant à une profonde pénétration réciproque, leur aura permis ensuite de se rétablir dans un nouvel ordre de densités sociales, sous une hégémonie, cette fois, positiviste<sup>1</sup>

This same idea of an alliance of the authoritarian forces of the world had been already expressed in 1894 by Hugues Rebell in a brochure entitled *L'Union des trois aristocraties*. Rebell was, until his death in 1905, one of the leading purveyors of Nietzschean doctrine in France and a fairly well known theorist of political reaction. He had been one of the first to present important portions of *Thus Spake Zarathustra* in translation (in *L'Hermitage* for 1893) and in 1894, the year of the appearance of *L'Union des trois aristocraties*, had attracted considerable attention with a poeticized version of certain Nietzschean theories in a collection entitled *Chants de la pluie et du soleil*. Had he lived a few years longer, he would undoubtedly have played an important role in the obstructionist movement led by Maurras and Léon Daudet.<sup>2</sup>

Rebell sees in democratic rule only stupid equality, in the fall of the old hierarchy only ruin for intellectualism and nobility of life. Egalitarianism has brought the rich man to apologize for his wealth,

<sup>1</sup> Julien Benda: *Dialogues à Byzance*, Paris (Editions de la Revue blanche), 1900, p. 92.

<sup>2</sup> For information on Rebell (by his true name, Georges Grassal) see Henri Mazel. "Hugues Rebell," *Mercur de France*, 54 (1905), pp. 481-502, Auriant. "La Jeunesse d'Hugues Rebell," *ibid.*, 217 (1930), pp. 277-308; and Remy de Gourmont. "Nouveaux Masques," *ibid.*, 24 (1897), pp. 67-88.

the titled gentleman to beg for inclusion in the vile plebe, the intellectual to prostitute himself to the masses for his daily bread. Christian humanitarianism only leads men to cry out against the strong, declaring that: "Nous ne voulons pas plus de supériorités intellectuelles que de supériorités sociales . . . vous, sots, malades, impuissants, vous êtes les égaux des forts, des sains, des intelligents, c'est l'arrêt de *notre* justice, la nouvelle et la meilleure."<sup>3</sup> So, if they would survive, the nobility of birth and the nobility of money must unite against their common enemy, democracy. But their union will be weak and purposeless if they do not possess some ideal of social action; it will be the function of the intellectual to forge this ideal for them and he must at all costs be enticed into the alliance. His situation is precarious enough in democracy to make it probable that he will wish to join them, for he has lost his old exemption from the law of the struggle-for-life and now lives only by pandering to the popular taste. It will be the function of such men as Rebell to create this alliance, to attract the gentleman from his alcove and his stables, to teach the rich man to spend shamelessly and freely, to persuade the intellectual to write with honesty and high purpose. And when they have succeeded in their cause, these makers of the union of tomorrow, the world will rise again from its Christian stagnation and desuetude and will become once more the dwelling-place of intellect and nobility of soul:

Quand on aura compris qu'il n'est pas de plus funeste mensonge que celui de l'égalité des hommes, qu'il n'est pas de société plus misérable que celle où l'on ne reconnaît aucune hiérarchie, quand cette richesse, cette noblesse, cette science qui se dissimulent ou se cachent aujourd'hui prendront conscience de leur valeur et, au lieu de demander pour le compte des autres, se battront pour leur propre cause, je vous assure qu'un nouvel ordre de choses se dessinera. Pour nous . . . nous ne cacherons point nos sentiments . . . Jugeant que la nature choisit certains êtres pour le pouvoir, nous détestons les gouvernements fondés sur la souveraineté de la populace et n'avons qu'un désir, c'est celui d'effacer de nos mœurs et de nos institutions le souvenir de Quatre-vingt-neuf.<sup>4</sup>

The very evident similarity of the two essays does not of course necessarily indicate that M. Benda borrowed the idea of *La Revanche du riche* from Hugues Rebell. He may well have arrived

<sup>3</sup> Hugues Rebell. *L'Union des trois aristocraties*, Paris (Bibliothèque Artistique et Littéraire), 1894, p. 26.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

independently at the same political solution as the apostle of Nietzschean reaction had a few years earlier. But it is at least interesting to note that at the outset of his career France's great present-day defender of pure democracy was echoing the thoughts of one of the predecessors of *Action française*. Had he followed these ideas in his later writings, he would have been led, inevitably, into the paths of nationalism, militarism and Fascism. His evolution to his present position had been a long one; it is all to the credit of his sense of social justice.

ROBERT J. NIESS

*Harvard University*

---

### THE "D. T." POEMS IN OVERBURY'S *A WIFE*

Among the various elegiac and commendatory poems prefixed to later editions of Sir Thomas Overbury's celebrated poem *A Wife nowe a Widowe* (1614) are three which bear the initials "D. T." There is no reason to doubt that all three are from the pen of the same man; and, as I hope to make apparent here, there is likewise little room to doubt that the writer was Daniel Tuvill. Indeed, as long ago as 1856 this identification was conjecturally advanced, but without supporting evidence, by Rimbault in his edition of Overbury's works.<sup>1</sup>

Strong presumptive evidence of identity is to be seen in the fact that in five of the six works now known to have been written by Tuvill, his authorship is acknowledged, either on the title-page or in prefatory epistles, by the bare use of the initials "D. T." This, in turn, is negatively supported by the *STC* entries of only two other writers bearing these initials: Daniel Tilenus (*STC* 24067-24072) and Daniel Tossanus (*STC* 24144-24145), the nature of whose works almost automatically precludes the ascription of the Overbury poems to either of them. Moreover, the presence of the "D. T." poems among several other sets of poems bearing initials confidently ascribed to writers of some literary note—William

<sup>1</sup> *The Miscellaneous Works in Prose and Verse of Sir Thomas Overbury, Knt.*, ed. Edward F. Rimbault (Library of Old Authors: London, 1890). On the first appearance of these initials Rimbault notes, p. 279: "Probably the same person who wrote *Essaies Politicke and Morall*, Lond. 1608, 12mo. His name is unknown."

was in press (May, 1616); and second, that the prosecution was opened by Sir Henry Montague,<sup>6</sup> Tuvill's patron and the dedicatee of two of his books.<sup>7</sup>

So far as is known, Tuvill published no volume of poetry. But his reading of the poets appears from almost every page of his prose works, and his own dabbling with verse may be followed in his customary translating of the Classic fragments he quotes. These, if not remarkable as poetry, are generally adequate and easy—of a level, I should say, with the three performances in *A Wife*. Furthermore, though their scope is far too limited to authorise confident assertion, the three "D. T." poems in *A Wife* offer, to anyone intimately acquainted with Tuvill's usual turn of expression, certain highly characteristic locutions. Distinctively Tuvillian, for instance, is the substitution of the comparative for the simple adjective in "their *chaster* influence";<sup>8</sup> and the contrast of inward-outward in "So faire without, so free from spot within" and in "the inward worth,/ The outward carriage"<sup>9</sup> is almost a

<sup>6</sup> See *DNB*, entries "Carr, Robert" and "Montagu, Sir Henry"; also Andrew Amos, *The Great Oyer of Poisoning* (London, 1856), pp. 122-24.

<sup>7</sup> *The Dove and the Serpent* (1614) and *Christian Purposes and Resolutions* (1622).

<sup>8</sup> Sig. 4. Extremely common in Tuvill's books; compare *Essaies Politicke, and Morall* (1608), "ruder ignorance," "vnriper youth" (sigs. A3v, F2v); *Essaies, Morall and Theologicall* (1609), "slower apprehension," "corrupter times" (sigs. B6, B11); *The Dove and the Serpent* (1614), "nobler bosome," "weaker pride" (sigs. A3, G3); *Asylum Veneris* (1616), "discreeter admiration," "duiner complement" (sigs. C3v, G)—and twenty-one other instances; *Christian Purposes and Resolutions* (1622), "profaner mindes," "younger Vnicornes" (sigs. M2, M6); *St Pauls Threefold Cord* (1635), "darker bowels," "unriper age" (sigs. B9, L3v).

<sup>9</sup> Sigs. A3, A3v. Of the many instances that could be adduced, compare with these the following. *EPM*, "inward disposition . . . outward imposture" (Q3r-v), "conceiue of their inward disposition, by their outward conversation" (F8); *EMT*, "outward markes of Priesthood . . . , impuritie . . . in their hearts" (B11), "countenance the outward action with some inward pittie" (D10); *DdS*, "compose thy inward minde, that thy outward carriage may continually be calme" (B2); *AV*, "This inward Beauty, graced with outward comelinesse" (A3v), "least want of grace in their outward gesture, might make their inward goodnesse liable to misconstruction" (D3); *CPAR*, "It is not the beauty of outward obiectes that attractes his Eye" (G10), "If the in-side of the Vessel be not cleane, let the out-side bee as glorious as it will . . ." (K10); *SPTC*, "inward, and spirituall man . . . outward Man" (N8).

mania with him. Other Tuvillian usages may be seen in "murdering hand, [w]oaded in guiltlesse blood,"<sup>10</sup> in "Couvre-feu Bell,"<sup>11</sup> and "Settled affections."<sup>12</sup>

Finally, a sonnet in the "Epilogue" to the *Asylum Veneris*<sup>13</sup>—judiciously, though silently, borrowed—reads almost as if Tuvill were deliberately annotating Overbury's poem:

Who doth desire, that chaste his wife should be  
First be he true, for truth doth truth deserue  
Then such he be, as she his worth may see,  
And one man still credit with her deserue.

Not toying kinde, nor causelessely vnkinde;  
Not stirring thoughts, nor yet denying right,  
Not spying faults, nor in plaine errors blinde,  
Neuer hard hand, nor euer raines too light.

As farre from want, as far from vaine expense;  
The one doth force, the later doth intice;  
Allow good companie, but keep from thence,  
All filthie mouthes, that glorie in their vice.

This done, thou hast no more, but leaue the rest,  
To Virtue, Fortune, Time, and Womens brest.

The doctrinaire "D. T." who bolstered his arguments with those lines was, at any rate, eminently qualified to contribute to the growing corpus of Overburiana.

JOHN LEON LIEVSAY

*The Folger Shakespeare Library*

<sup>10</sup> Sig. 4; compare *Asylum Veneris*, sig. Cr, "an outward dye, not woaded with any grace or abilities." My italics.

<sup>11</sup> Sig. 4r, compare *Asylum Veneris*, sig. L4, "But the Coudre-feu Bell hath alreadie rung."

<sup>12</sup> Sig. A3. I do not find this identical combination in Tuvill, yet it is exactly what might be expected. He seldom uses *affection* without a preceding adjectival modifier; and *settled* is of fairly common occurrence in his works. Compare the following phrasal combinations: *EPM*, "vnsettled iudgement" (P6v); *EMT*, "settled countenance" (I4); *D&S*, "settled truthe" (D), *AV*, "settled Grauitie" (D3); *EPM*, "vehement affection," "charitable affection," "disordinate . . . affection" (D4, D5, G4); *EMT*, "irregular affections" (C2); *D&S*, "singular affection" (F3v); *CPAR*, "louing affection," "vnbrideled Affection" (D, E4); *SPTC*, "sinister affections," "froward Affection," "passionate Affection" (E3, F10r, P).

<sup>13</sup> Sig. K. From Book III of Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia* (ed. 1598), sigs. Ii4v-Ii5; reprinted in *Englands Parnassus* (1600), ed. Charles Crawford (Oxford, 1913), pp. 27-28.

THE EMBLEME FOR DECEMBER IN THE  
SHEPHEARDES CALENDER

To the text of each eclogue of *The Shepheardes Calender* is appended an "Embleme." Spenser uses the word *embleme* rather loosely, explaining what he means by equating it, in January, April, June, July, August, September, with *poesye*.<sup>1</sup> Some of the "emblems" would be suitable for the *impreses* popular in the time, such as that for November, which was Marot's *impresa*, or Willyes for August: *Vinto non vitto*. Others, as for February and March, go beyond the few words permitted to an *impresa*.<sup>2</sup> The motto for December has always been lacking, though copies of the first edition show in the proper place the heading "Colins Embleme," with the space between it and the printer's ornament below that is normal when a motto of one line is used. The embleme for October is curious, with its *etc.*, and the Glosse implies that there should be one for Piers as well as for Cuddie. So two emblems out of twelve are imperfect. Hughes supplied an embleme for December.

Vivitur ingenio, caetera mortis erunt.

This fits the idea admirably, but there is no reason to suppose it the motto Spenser had in mind. Incidentally, it does not have the flavor of the other emblems, which usually involve a jangle of sound, if by no more than rime, or suggest the motto of an *impresa*, these qualities are least evident in those for April, but even they still have an allusive quality, reminding the reader of a scene instead of stating an idea directly; the embleme supplied by Hughes is a plain assertion.

At the very end of the Calender stands a motto that in its repetition of sound, its brevity, its cryptic quality, resembles but perhaps surpasses some of those attached to the eclogues. It seems isolated, even meaningless where it stands, having no obvious relation to anything. The verses that precede it, the envoy of the poem,

<sup>1</sup> For a *poesie* as the motto of an *impresa*, see Samuel Daniel, *Works* (Spenser Society), iv. 17, 22, 25; v. 298, 302.

<sup>2</sup> "The mot or posie of an *Impresa* may not exceede three words" (Samuel Daniel, To the Friendly Reader, before *The Worthy Tract of Paulus Jovius, containing a Discourse of rare inventions, both military and Amorous, called Imprese*, *Works* iv. 25).



corresponding to the verses *To His Booke* at the beginning, seem to form a suitable conclusion, rendering anything further superfluous. To this motto no editor has given any attention; the Variorum records no comment. It is printed in the same type as the emblems for the various months and would fit the space left between *Colins Embleme* and the printer's ornament at the end of December.<sup>8</sup> But what of its meaning, allowing for the indirectness suited to an *impresa*? The glosse says of the missing embleme for December: "The meaning whereof is that all thinges perish and come to theyr last end." This is true of *merce*, which means *wares, goodes, merchandise*, referring to the perishing riches of the world. The glosse continues: "workes of learned wits and monuments of Poetry abide for ever." This is true of *mercede*, the *reward* of the poet, fame, which does not perish but is the monument of brass spoken of by Horace. *Merce* perishes, but not *mercede*. Something of this appears in lines in October, also on the poet:

Cuddie, the prayse is better than the price,  
The glory eke much greater then the gayne (19-20).

Perhaps a printer directed to put *Merce non mercede* after the last eclogue put it instead after the last verses he saw, those of the envoy. At any rate, it seems likely that the words were intended as Colins embleme.

ALLAN H. GILBERT

*Duke University*

### HABINGTON'S *CASTARA* AND THE DATE OF HIS MARRIAGE

Arber states that the marriage of William Habington and Lucy Herbert, daughter of the first Lord Powis, took place "between 1630 and 1633: later than which it cannot be: as the anniversary of his wedding day is celebrated in verse."<sup>1</sup> Probably following

<sup>8</sup> Professor Charles G. Osgood, editor of the *Shepheardes Calender* in the Variorum Spenser, and Professor Don Cameron Allen have kindly examined rotographs of the Huntington copy. See also H. Oskar's Sommer's facsimile, London 1890

<sup>1</sup> *Castara*, London, 1870, p. 4. The poem to which Arber refers is "Loves Aniversarie," *Castara*, London, 1634, p. 73.

the lead of Arber, A. H. Bullen gives the date of the marriage as "sometime between 1630 and 1633."<sup>2</sup>

There is evidence to show that this event, so important to the poet and to his book, occurred in the spring of 1633. In several poems which appear in the first edition of *Castara* (1634), Habington laments the absence of his mistress. In the first of these, he complains of her absence in the country.<sup>3</sup> In the next, he mentions the town of Marlow, and "Seymours," the house in which she was living.<sup>4</sup> In the next, he implies that he has been denied access to "Seymours."<sup>5</sup> In another poem of the series,<sup>6</sup> he mentions the spring, and in an address to the "house of Seymours" he mentions the spring again.<sup>7</sup>

Since the leases to "Seymours" were not assigned to Eleanor Herbert, Lucy's mother, until 1633,<sup>8</sup> it is evident that Habington could not have been denied the premises before 1633 unless the Herberts took possession before the lease was signed, which is not likely, and we may suppose that the marriage had not taken place before the spring of 1633.

The first edition of *Castara* was entered in the *Stationers' Register* on March 21st, 1633/34,<sup>9</sup> and the poem which marks the anniversary of the wedding appears in this edition; consequently, as Arber points out, the marriage must have taken place in 1633. The signs of spring which Habington mentions in the poems addressed to Castara at "Seymours" could not have appeared much before the end of February; therefore, we may assume that the wedding came late in February or in March of 1633, quite probably during the latter month.

HOMER C. COMBS

Washington University

---

<sup>2</sup> *D N B*, VIII, p. 858.

<sup>3</sup> *Castara*, London, 1634, p. 24.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, p. 25.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*, p. 27.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid*, p. 28.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid*, p. 33.

<sup>8</sup> *Victoria County History of Buckingham*, III (1925), p. 74.

<sup>9</sup> *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640* Edited by Edward Arber. 5 vol., London, 1877, IV, p. 288.

## COWLEY'S PINDAR

Cowley's study of the text and critical apparatus of Pindar has never been doubted; but thanks to his Latin paraphrases and the glosses on his translations of the Second Olympic and the First Nemeaeon, one is able to place one's finger on the exact edition that Cowley used. As Shafer pointed out many years ago,<sup>1</sup> there were numerous editions available to Cowley. Three of these editions had distinct Latin versions. The Stephanus translation of 1560 was the earliest and the 1616 translation of Schmidt as well as the 1620 metaphrastic version of Benedictus are based on it. The Benedictus text also contains a paraphrastic translation of great fullness, but it is the metaphrastic version, with the sort of variants that one finds whenever a man of the seventeenth century quotes Latin, that Cowley adopted. A few lines from the third stanza of the Second Olympic suggest the method that is followed in both of Cowley's Latin translations.

## COWLEY

Actorum autem vel iure vel injuria infectum ne Tempus quidem omnium pater possit reddere operum finem Sed Oblivio cum sorte prospera fiat. Bonis enim a gaudiis malum molestum domitum perit, quando divina sors mittit de caelo altas divitias.

## BENEDICTUS (Metaphrasis)

Actorum autem iure vel iniuriae infectum ne tempus quidem omnium parens possit reddere operum finem. Sed oblivio sorte cum prospera esse possit. Bonis enim a gaudiis malum perit odiosum domitum Quando divina sors miserit sursum opes altas.

## STEPHANUS

Antea actorum autem operum finem & cum iure & praeter ius, infectum ne ipsum quidem tempus omnium parens possit reddere: sed oblivio, sorte cum prospera esse possit. Bonis enim a gaudiis malum perit odiosum domitum quando Dei numen mittit tandem opes altas.

## SCHMIDT

Factorum autem justaeque & praeter jus, infectum, ne quidem Tempus omnium parens possit efficere, operum finem. Oblivio autem eorum sorte cum felici feri potest. Bonis enim a gaudiis, malum perit odiosum superatum, quando Dei numen mittit eminus beatitatem excelsam.

<sup>1</sup> *The English Ode to 1660* (Princeton, 1918), pp. 56-7; see also J. Loiseau, *Abraham Cowley* (Paris, 1931), p. 351.

The verbal similarities that exist between the Latin version of Cowley and that of Benedictus indicate that Cowley patterned his translation on the French metaphrase. The dependence of Cowley on Benedictus may be further indicated by comparing the scholia. Schmidt's scholia is sometimes taken over by Benedictus, but there are enough additions in the French text that are adopted by Cowley to suggest that when Schmidt and Benedictus have an annotation in common, the latter is Cowley's authority. The notes taken over from Benedictus edition for the Second Olympic are ' 1. 1 (B. 36), 1. 2 (B. 38), 1. 3 (B. sig. C iv), 1. 4 (B. 39), 2. 1 (B. 41), 2. 2 (B. 42) (B. 37), 2. 3 (B. 42), 3. 1 (B. 44, trans. by Cowley), 5. 2-3 (B. 50), 5. 4 (B. 37), 5. 5 (B. 52), 7. 1 (B. 56), 7. 2 (B. 57), 7. 3 (B. 58), 9. 2 (B. 62). The other notes seem to have been supplied by Cowley from his own vast fund of classical learning though at times he follows the hints of Benedictus. The story of Ino and Semele at 3. 2 is added in this way and so is the full story of Oedipus at 4. 2. The references to Homer at 7. 1 and to Vergil at 7. 2 are given by Benedictus, but Cowley looked up the quotation.

I suppose it is not much to point out this relationship, but it may give someone a clearer idea of how Cowley worked and a more patient scholar than I might like to demonstrate at some length Cowley's method of translation and the sources of the annotations on his original odes.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

#### W. E. LEONARD'S ANNOTATIONS IN A COPY OF *POEMS 1916-1917*

The late Professor William Ellery Leonard's *Poems 1916-1917*, privately printed, bears no date of publication. A copy of this somewhat rare book was presented in 1925 to Charles Bulger, now Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Akron, by Leonard. His attitude toward Germany and the Allies is explained in the final sentence of the Preface (page 8): "Hence it is that 'justice to Germany,' rather than 'above the battle,' is the dominant note in these pages—justice to Germany, with hatred, however, to none of her foemen, except the arch-foemen, Ignorance, Slander, and Hypocrisy." Various notes in the author's handwriting are

of interest and are perhaps elsewhere unrecorded. These notes and annotations are as follows.

1. On the front inside cover:

Note These jottings in rhyme, written during the war-fury in protest against the utterly uncritical and unjust attitude of America, partake to be sure of the belligerency of the times; yet, deducing [*sic*] a few casual martial notes of defiance against the martial notes around me, I'd say the general sound ~~was~~ is to me still acceptable, certainly far nearer the truth (as time is showing) than the states of mind to which it was a reaction. The volume has not circulated much—even privately—but may sometime be of interest as a contemporary record.

W E L

An arrow drawn to the fly leaf indicates an afterthought:

Many of the verses were published in newspapers and non-de-script magazines under the pseudon, "Oliver Ames."

2. Written on the fly leaf is the following inscription:

For Charles Bulger, on the occasion of his receiving his Doctor's degree, from his colleague—William Ellery Leonard.

Jan 1925,  
Madison, Wis.

3. On page 6 of the Preface Leonard says that under President Wilson our foreign policy has progressed toward neutrality and has opportunity now to assist, "*perhaps to lead, in the restoration of peace and the reconstruction of Europe.*" Leonard has underscored the words within the quotation marks. Written in the margin opposite is a note:

I missed my guess here!<sup>1</sup>—see accompanying off print of letter to N. Y. *Nation*<sup>1</sup>

4. At the foot of page 8 of the Preface, just below the printed date, "January, 1917," stands the penned note:

<sup>1</sup> The off print of which he speaks is a column length letter (CX, 109, Jan. 24, 1920) under the caption, "The Man With the Yellow Streak" Written on the off print are a few notes in Leonard's hand. In the letter the printed words, "*this plausible document,*" are underscored by him, and in the margin opposite is written "= League of Nations of course." Following the printed date at the end of the letter, "January 1," is written "1920"; and under this in turn is written "written July 1919." After the printed pseudonym, "Robert Wylie Weldon," Leonard has signed his initials, "= W E L." Below his pseudonym he has penned (by way of explaining it): "Wiley Well-Done!"

Written toward the end of 1916—and years before overwhelming evidence of the truth of these contentions was forthcoming *Intelligence* did not need more evidence than was available from the start

5. The poem "The Frankenstein" begins on page 25; under the title is a printed excerpt. "This Monster without a soul, this man-made Mockery, the Frankenstein of States, the Shame and Terror of Civilization—" *Newspaper Editorial.*" On page 26 Leonard has written the following footnote:

Yet, if I had but reperused it myself, I would have noted that *Frankenstein* was the name, not of the monster, but of the man who made it!

6. "The Myth," on page 42 begins with the words, "The prophet speaks"; there is a superscription after the word *prophet* and a printed footnote: "I can not bring myself to mention his name. He is now dead." Under this Leonard has written:

Josiah Royce, Prof. Philosophy, Harvard Univ

CHARLES DUFFY

University of Akron

# T. S. ELIOT, MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS, AND GUILLAUME DE MACHAUT

Wallace Fowlie, in his brilliant study of T. S. Eliot's poetry 'comme un jeu du temps,' writes of 'East Coker,' in the *Four Quartets*:

Le premier vers 'In my beginning is my end' et le dernier vers: 'In my end is my beginning' rappellent l'inscription qui se trouvait sur la chaise de Marie, reine d'Écosse: 'En ma fin est mon commencement.' Eliot, par son premier vers, annonce le dilemme temporel de l'homme le commencement d'une vie humaine est déjà un acheminement vers la fin de cette vie; et par son dernier vers, il constate le paradoxe spirituel de l'homme la fin de la vie terrestre marque le vrai commencement, celui de l'autre réalité.<sup>1</sup>

In the most recent examination of the *Four Quartets*, Raymond Preston repeats this ascription to the motto of Mary, Queen of Scots.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wallace Fowlie, 'T. S. Eliot—la poésie comme un jeu du temps,' in *La Pureté dans l'Art*, Montreal, 1941, pp. 78-9.

<sup>2</sup> Raymond Preston, 'Four Quartets' *Rehearsed*, New York and London, 1946, p. 24: "We might call the next Quartet ['East Coker'] 'Variations

There is no question that Mary Stuart embroidered on her chair the motto—there is ample evidence of her accomplishments in embroidery. But behind the chair of Mary stands the figure of Guillaume de Machaut, whose rondel enunciates, with curious anticipation of Eliot's treatment, this 'Theme of Mary, Queen of Scots':

Ma fin est mon commencement  
Et mon commencement ma fin  
  
Et teneure vraiment  
Ma fin est mon commencement  
  
Mes tiers chans. 113 fois seulement  
Se retrograde et ainsi fin.  
Ma fin est mon commencement  
Et mon commencement ma fin<sup>3</sup>

It is interesting to note the play in the fifth and sixth lines, itself like *un jeu du temps*<sup>4</sup>

It is possible that Mary Stuart's motto had currency in the sixteenth century (and here her tutelage by Ronsard should certainly be borne in mind), though Machaut himself seems not to have been well known at this time. About Mr. Eliot there is no uncertainty: he has stated<sup>5</sup> that he has certainly never read this poem. But Machaut's poem establishes the theme evoked by Eliot's lines with greater validity than the simple motto 'En ma fin est mon commencement' embroidered on Mary's chair.

R. J. SCHOECK

Princeton, New Jersey

on a Theme of Mary, Queen of Scots', for although the poem begins with an inversion of the theme, the motto stated in its original form at the end informs and unifies the whole pattern. . . "

<sup>3</sup> Machaut, *Poésies Lyriques*, ed. V. Chichmaref, Paris, 1909, II, 575

<sup>4</sup> Of this 'canonically written rondeau' Paul Henry Lang writes (*Music in Western Civilization*, New York, 1941, p. 155) that "it marks a step beyond the simple *chace* and leads to the intricate canonic art which was to appear in the following century. It is a composition of complicated construction, written so that all three voices are capable of double employment, that is, they may be sung either forward or backward"

<sup>5</sup> In a private letter, January, 1947.

A. E. HOUSMAN AND THE NEW PREFECT OF THE  
AMBROSIAN

In the year 1910 the late Alfred Housman contributed to the *Classical Review*<sup>1</sup> a brief critique of Msgr. Achille Ratti's monograph on some fragments of an ancient codex of Juvenal recently discovered in the Ambrosian Library. With the new prefect's general conclusions Housman picks no quarrel, but in a final paragraph he reveals both his humanity and his inhumanity:

It was a fine August morning which placed in Monsignore Ratti's hand the envelope containing this fragment, and he gives us leave to imagine the trepidation with which he opened it and the joy with which he discovered that the parchment was in two pieces instead of one. When a scholar is so literary as all this, it would be strange if he were quite accurate: accordingly his transcript of the text has three misprints in its second line, he quotes from the *Classical Review* of 1809, he has discovered, and frequently cites, an edition of Juvenal by J. P. Postgate; Friedlander's edition he provides with *Aumer Kungen*, and confers on Mr Chatelain the baptismal name of Hemilius.

At least three of the errors which Housman cites ("1809" for "1909", "*Aumer Kungen*" for "*Anmerkungen*"; "Hemilius" for "Aemilius") are so obvious as to suggest the possible peccability of "Adam scribeyn." But it cannot be denied that the prefect was peculiarly unfortunate in attributing an edition of Juvenal to J. P. Postgate; for though the latter was the general editor of the series in which it appeared, its particular editor was none other than our modest reviewer himself!

All his Latinity shrunk to the two narrow words, he now lies buried in Ludlow churchyard under a horizontal slab inscribed "Hic Jacet A. E. H." He who was ever a Salopian in sympathy is at long last one by local habitation. As for the sometime prefect, the simple Latin legend on his tomb in the grotto of St. Peter's tells us that he died Pius XI.

ROBERT J. KANE

*Ohio State University*

<sup>1</sup> xxiv, 161.



OVID'S MULBERRY IN MILTON'S *PRO SE DEFENSIO*

Milton uses the following scrap of Latin verse

Poma alba ferebat,  
Qui post nigra tulit Morus (Col ed, ix, 208)

It is adapted from Ovid:

An, quae poma alba ferebat,  
Ut nunc nigra ferat contactu sanguinis arbor (*Met* 4 51-2)

The tree is identified as the mulberry or *morus* (*Met.* 4. 90), and the second line is adapted to fit it to Milton's attack on Alexander More (*Morus*).

ALLAN H. GILBERT

Duke University

---

 REVIEWS
 

---

*English Literature in the Seventeenth Century. 1600-1660.* By DOUGLAS BUSH. Oxford: OUP, 1945. Pp vi + 621. \$7.50.

Chapters eight, nine, ten, and twelve, dealing respectively with political, scientific, and religious thought, and with Milton, are the outstanding features of this book. Its great omission, for which its title gives no warning, is the drama. Its scheme does not admit Shakespeare the dramatist though it salutes Shakespeare the Christian humanist and bearer of the tradition that "comes from Plato and Cicero down through Erasmus and others to such men as Spenser, Hooker, Daniel, Chapman, and Jonson." Jonson appears only as poet, epigrammatist, and critic, and the most interesting reference to his plays recalls that in his dedication of *Volpone* to the Two Universities he defended the doctrine that a great poet is first of all a good man. His epigrams (the "ripest" of his studies) and poems, viewed in the light of *Timber*, are seen as the offspring of his ethical conception of art—"a strong, massive, symmetrical pyramid, if not 'a Star-pointing' one" Bush acknowledges that Jonson is almost a stranger to the realms of 'Full fathom five' and 'The Retreat,' and to the unquiet regions that were within the range of Donne's "cynical or passionate dramatic force," but he warns Donne's "modern devotees" that they "have seldom grasped the breadth and depth of Spenser, Jonson, and Milton."

Donne's modern devotees may well object to the campaign

against them in almost every chapter of this book. Idolators like the girl and hierophants like the professor in Mark Schorer's story "Boy in Summer Sun" will accuse Bush of bad taste. Revaluators who "compare bits of *Paradise Lost* with the short pieces of the metaphysical poets or with the dramatic texture of Shakespeare" will resent his fair charge that they are idlers. Some unfairness may be read by most of us into his contrast of Donne's metaphor of the new-discovered America as applied to a woman's body with Bacon's use of it to symbolize the discoveries of Science and with Spenser's application of it to his ideal fairyland. Few of those who are entitled to an opinion will challenge Bush's preference for the piety of Bishop Andrewes' prayers to the "repetitious expansiveness," the "masochistic exhibitionism" and the "brooding, agitated egoism and unrestraint" of Donne's *Devotions*, or his aspersion of Donne's religious love and wonder as less genuine than Sir Thomas Browne's. To call the spiritual nourishment of Donne's sermons thin in comparison with Whichcote's *Aphorisms* gives the latter an edge that is perhaps mainly due to their genre. But Bush does not wage a sniping campaign and he challenges openly on the main ground that, "while the greatest artists dominate and unify experience, . . . Donne's fragments of experience remain fragments, . . . his sensibility is not unified but multiple." Believing that Donne's wit was too often the voice of "the discontents and libertine consolations of intellectuals who had outgrown the old virtues," Bush attacks the "standard dogma of our time" that "Donne embodied the unified sensibility that Milton was to split up." He refuses to consider Donne the poet apart from Donne the theologian, priest, and courtier, and so he cannot understand why "Donne's orthodoxy and uniformity should appeal less to the modern mind than Milton's independent creed."

In spite of his prosecution of Donne for the weaknesses that modern taste has misvalued, no one knows better than Bush how to use Donne's "wit, intensity, learning, and intellectual pressure" or his "personal intimacy, everyday realism, and verbal and metrical power" as touchstones in measuring other metaphysicals. Though his recognition of the unmatched power of metaphysical poetry to embody the "sensuous apprehension of thought," may not satisfy its admirers, he insists no more firmly than does the carefully impartial Robert Sharp (in *From Donne to Dryden*) that subjectivity and indifference to general truths are metaphysical characteristics, or that metaphysical wit died of its own excesses before *Paradise Lost* was born. Bush's contempt for the "pernicious anaemia of the secular metaphysical muse, dwindling from cosmic audacities to pretty, labored, eccentric artifice," may do some injustice to the "Mob of Gentlemen who wrote with Ease," but when he comes to a great talent like Marvell's he does not yield to Mr. Leavis in perception of why it is that the *Horatian Ode* is a "perfect triumph of civilization, unique in English." It is instructive to compare Mr.

Leavis' unfavorable comparison of *Comus* with the *Dialogue between the Resolved Soul and Created pleasure* (in *Revaluation*, p. 28) on the ground of Marvell's fusion of a wide range of maturely valued interests in his wit and of his "seriousness, the finer wisdom of a ripe civilization," with Bush's more relevant location of the *Dialogue* relatively to Donne and Vaughan in the metaphysical tradition and in the tradition of Platonic humanism relatively to the fable of the "Choice of Hercules," with its roots reaching back to Prodicus and its topmost branch ending in Cowley's *The Soul*.

Another comparison between *English Literature in the Seventeenth Century* and *Revaluation* may be drawn on the basis of Mr. Leavis' protest against the stubborn survival, "in spite of the recent readjustment of perspective" upon "Mr. Waller's service in reforming our numbers," of the view that the line of development of the heroic couplet stretches from Waller to Denham, to Dryden, to Pope. "The line," says Mr. Leavis, one-dimensionally still, "runs from Ben Jonson (and Donne) through Carew to Marvell to Pope." Bush's interest in the evolution of the couplet is two- or three-dimensional. He sees it "forwarded by the translators of the ancient elegiac distich like Marlowe and Heywood" and especially Sandys "in his *Ovid*, seeking literalness and compression more than ornament" and contributing to the "development of neo-classical poetic diction" hardly less than did Drayton in the often closed and antithetical couplets of *England's Heroical Epistles*. Beside Jonson we see a minor figure like Sir John Beaumont making his symptomatic contribution to the evolution of the closed couplet and in the critical dimension advancing it through the verse-essay, *To his late Majesty, concerning the True Form of English Poetry*. In the practice of the couplet we are reminded that Denham and Godolphin stood beside Waller, whose indebtedness to Fairfax was familiar to Dryden. And beside Fairfax and the others already named Bush sees the couplet as stemming from troops of minors; Hall, Drummond, Sylvester, Henry King, Lord Falkland, Cartwright, and more. Mr. Leavis' "line" has become a stream fed by half the poetic springs of the century though among those springs Donne is not included.

The basic evolutionary problem of the century as Bush regards it is the cultural change lying roughly between Peacham's "emphasis on religion and virtue united with good letters and knightly exercises and his constant appeal to classical precept and example" in the *Complete Gentleman* (1622) and Francis Osborn's repudiation of the "humanistic ideal in the interest of practical experience, mundane utility and success, and Chesterfieldian *savoir faire*" in the *Advice to a Son* (1656). No thesis is formulated and there is no attempt to indict a nation or an age, but the drift is clear in the cross-currents of the character which finally abandon Earle's admirable Polonian old man and his "immortal Hodge," so unlike "the peasant of modern fiction, since he has 'reason enough to doe

his businesse, and not enough to be idle or melancholy.'” Bush is frank in his preference for the early essayists and character-writers, “who rarely scrutinize the fundamentals of orthodox religion and morality,” to Samuel Butler, Osborn, and Richard Whitlock, the sceptics who learned more from Montaigne and Charron than they did from Bacon.

The treatment of Bacon is rather tender. While recognizing that his dream of a scientific *Summa* was scholastic and rhetorical and that “many illustrations of his idols can be found in his . . . natural histories,” Bush, though he refers vaguely to Whitehead, essentially contradicts Whitehead’s assertion that by thinking “qualitatively and not quantitatively” Bacon “completely missed the tonality which lay behind the success of seventeenth century science”<sup>1</sup> While acknowledging Bacon’s mathematical shortcoming Bush sees him as representing “a transitional phase of escape from the medieval qualitative conception of matter,” and as “a link between Campanella and Leibniz” (though not between Galileo and Newton), thanks to “his fusion of a limited mechanism with dynamism.”<sup>2</sup> Thus Bacon is saved from the charge of Baconianism and we hear nothing but the tragic irony in his hope; “Only let the human race recover the right over nature which belongs to it by divine bequest, and let power be given it, the exercise thereof will be governed by sound reason and true religion.” It is left for the Cartesians and finally for Hobbes, “the new Protagoras, who made absolute Bacon’s divorce between philosophy and religion,” to sever “the golden chain that bound nature and man to God.”<sup>3</sup>

Bush’s sympathy both in the chapters on science and religion is with the men who, like the later Cambridge Platonists and Milton, tried and failed to repair the broken chain. He sets the Cambridge group in the main stream of philosophy by making them “the founders of British idealism,” and sees in their doctrine of right reason something like a final justification for Henry More’s faith in “a perpetual peace and agreement betwixt Truth & Truth, be they of what nature or kind soever.” Bush accepts the implications of his attachment to the Cambridge men for the history of philosophy generally, and does not hesitate to move Lord Herbert of Cherbury, “the Bacon of metaphysics and epistemology,” out of the main stream though in an earlier chapter his “real importance in the history of philosophy” is acknowledged.

<sup>1</sup> A. N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World*, New York, 1925, p. 66.

<sup>2</sup> *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century*, p. 266. Perhaps the best justification of Bush’s statement to be found in Bacon is that in *Novum Organum*, II, viii, and the discussion of the doctrine of forms in II, ix, but to the present writer they seem inconclusive. Perhaps the best support for Bush’s view is to be found in Bacon’s conception of heat as involving motion.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 349. Cf. the final word of regret there that modern “religions of man and nature . . . cut loose from the seventeenth century Platonists’ deep roots of Christian faith and right reason.”

It would be quite unfair to imply that Bush makes any pretense of rewriting the history of philosophy anent science, religion, or even politics. The best features of his eighth chapter are its recognition of the intrinsic interest of the Puritan vision of a Christian society and its meaning for literature, its analysis of a changing Calvinism as a kind of literary substratum, and its tracing of the roots of the Puritan revolution to Catholicism and continental Protestantism. Bush does not entirely sympathize with the middle class revolutionists who asserted "their economic, political, and religious claims against a royalist and Anglican regime," and he refuses to regard the man who is becoming more and more the hero and saint of the movement from which he stood so largely apart, Gerald Winstanley, as in any degree a Marxist precursor. Quite rightly Winstanley is put into "the long line of Christian communists who had pleaded for the underdog since the Middle Ages."

The finest chapter in the book is the last one, which treats Milton both as artist and thinker. It is both a clear distillate of everything in modern Miltonic scholarship and a cogent defense of the position with which Bush's readers are already familiar in *Paradise Lost in Our Time*. For the facile ironists who smile at Milton for ingeminating that his "theme . . . is somewhere above him, and he must obtain an 'answerable style'" and who frown at him for justifying "God's punishing us for becoming what at our best we are" Bush's pleading of the case may not be satisfactory. They must, however, be a little grateful to him for so brilliant a challenge to their condescension to 'the noble voice.'

This review would be a disservice to all who may be interested in the present volume of the Oxford Histories of English Literature if it did not mention the very useful Chronological Tables of public events, literary history, verse, prose, and drama (pp. 405-439) and the invaluable bibliography (pp. 440-610)

MERRITT Y. HUGHES

University of Wisconsin

---

*Hamlet without Tears.* By I. J. SEMPER. Dubuque, Iowa. The Loras College Press, 1946. Pp. 107. \$1.50.

*Prefaces to Shakespeare.* By HARLEY GRANVILLE-BARKER. Volume I. Hamlet, King Lear, The Merchant of Venice, Antony and Cleopatra, Cymbeline. Volume II. Othello, Coriolanus, Julius Caesar, Romeo and Juliet, Love's Labour's Lost. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1946, 1947. Pp. viii + 543, viii + 449. \$5.00 each.

Mr. Semper's oddly-named book on *Hamlet* consists of six semi-detached essays. In one of them he rejects, quite properly, the

idea that Shakespeare implanted a controversy over the nature of ghosts in his play. In another he discusses the prayer scene, excusing Hamlet's "shocking" soliloquy as emanating from a momentarily unbalanced mind. In a third he argues cogently against the skepticism sometimes imputed to Hamlet without attaining equal success in imputing orthodoxy instead. In another he considers Hamlet as an embodiment of the Renaissance ideal of the gentleman. The nearest thing to a central idea is, I think, his theory that the ghost as a visitor from purgatory is the agent of divine justice rather than of blood revenge. This thesis is part of what seems to be the principal aim of the book—to capture *Hamlet* for Thomism.

Mr. Semper's book is thoughtful, moderate, and intelligent. It is welcome for calling attention once again to the unique spiritual (*theological* is Mr. Semper's word) implications of *Hamlet*, which confronts death and broods over it as no other tragedy of Shakespeare's does. But it does not illuminate the play very brightly. I do not say so because I would quarrel with its arguments or its conclusions. Some of them I do think decidedly dubious,<sup>1</sup> but if they were impeccable I should still say so. I say so because I think that we shall never pluck out the heart of Hamlet's mystery by rationalizing the play. Indeed, we shall never pluck out the heart of Hamlet's mystery, and there is not much use in trying. A play—above all, a poetic tragedy—is not a theorem, it is an experience, or, as Sir Harley Granville-Barker puts it, a magic spell. To compress it within logical or rational dimensions is to tarnish its grandeur, to clip its wings. *Hamlet* is not medieval and orthodox and Thomistic; it is medieval and Renaissance and modern, orthodox and skeptical, Thomistic and naturalistic—it is everything. It may not satisfy the mind unless one makes a careful selection from its multitudinousness, as Mr. Semper (among many others) has done, but to expect satisfaction of the mind rather than exhilaration of the whole being is the capital fallacy of literary criticism. We are only playing a solemn game with ourselves when we put the strait-jacket of a formula on a work of art like *Hamlet* to which

<sup>1</sup> I question the assumption that parallels from St. Thomas to utterances from the play prove something. To Mr Semper they prove that "*Hamlet* is fundamentally medieval in outlook," that "In *Hamlet* the Church is the visible representative of the supernatural" (p 97). Discussing Hamlet's "profound reverence" for the angels, he even cites Marcellus's remark about the ghost, "For it is as the air, invulnerable," as a reflection of the views of St. Thomas on the corporality of spirits. What does Mr. Semper suppose that non-Catholic ghosts are made of? To me the parallels illustrate the fact that the *Summa*, like the Thirty-nine Articles or the Heidelberg Catechism, is mostly an exposition of fundamentals on which all branches of Christianity are agreed. I question the usefulness of the kind of argument to which Mr. Semper has recourse on p 55. Since the ghost returns from purgatory and is therefore assured of salvation, when Hamlet, in the prayer scene, "virtually regards his father's spirit as a lost soul" *Hamlet* must be mad.

the spectator's imagination responds far more ardently than his reason.

On this account I prefer the criticism of Sir Harley Granville-Barker (who, by the bye, says flatly that Shakespeare "cannot, if he would, meddle with theology"). The series of nine prefaces which he published in England between 1927 and 1945, plus a new one on *Coriolanus*, have now appeared in this country in a handsome two-volume edition. Since in twenty years or less they have been widely recognized as one of the most distinguished discussions of Shakespeare's art of our time, it is perhaps more necessary to call attention to their accessibility to American readers than to reassess them.

A few words should be said about the preface to *Coriolanus*, however, but not many, for it is all of a piece with the others. It is a full, alert, and suggestive analysis, keenly alive to the impressions that will be and must be made upon an audience. It is full of provocative asides, the footnotes on the stage-directions are here especially stimulating. It rides the author's favorite hobby-horse, his idea that in the later plays Shakespeare could command the services of actors capable of far more subtlety than their predecessors of the nineties, and I must say gives his notion some stout support. If there is none of the brilliance that distinguishes some of Granville-Barker's observations on *Antony and Cleopatra* or *Lear*, it is no doubt because *Coriolanus* is the most unequivocal of Shakespeare's mature plays and does not yield so rich a return to sympathetic perception as most of the other tragedies.

The familiar prefaces stand up well under rereading. It is true that Granville-Barker is not above a bit of rationalizing himself; he even finds deep meanings in the snatches of the ballad of Jephtha which Hamlet quotes, and at p. 258, after considerable ratiocination in a manner unlike that of his earlier discussion of the play, he brings forth "the master-clue to Hamlet's 'mystery.'" He has a weakness for sweeping statements, such as that the spiritual issues of *Hamlet* would not "touch the conscience of the positive eighteenth century" or that Shakespeare "cannot, if he would, meddle with theology," and for large assumptions, such as those which underlie his somewhat magisterial pronouncements, apropos of *Cymbeline*, on the quiddity of private-theater plays and playing. He gives the impression of being ill at ease in discussing technical problems like the integrity of the text of *Cymbeline*, and what he says is less illuminating than usual. He is, perhaps inevitably, more successful with some plays than with others. Pride of place and almost half of one volume go to the preface to *Hamlet*, but I should not put it at the top of the scale of merit. It is notorious that no one really likes anybody else's idea of *Hamlet*, but Granville-Barker's concept of the prince as "a human soul adrift" seems no more likely to gain a convert or two than the rest.

But all these niggling reservations are a very light counterpoise

to the solid merits of Granville-Barker's work. The greatest merit of all is seeing the plays as wholes, as stories acted, and tracing their power to their dramatic and theatrical values. This sharpening of the critical focus is, I believe, Granville-Barker's greatest service, greater than his elucidations of speeches, scenes, and plays, valuable as these often are. Unless I misread the signs, these prefaces seem likely to have a lasting effect upon our attitude toward Shakespeare's plays, in the future we shall less often look at them through the haze of Hegelian metaphysics, medieval cosmology, Galenic physiology, or Elizabethan politics rather than in the clear light of the stage where they were born. Granville-Barker has done more than any one else to take the critic of Shakespeare out of his book-lined study and put him into a seat on the aisle, or a stool in the pit, and that is a real and an honorable achievement.

M. A. SHABER

University of Pennsylvania

---

*Li Compilacions de le science des estoilles*, Books I-III. By LEOPOLD OF AUSTRIA. Edited from MS French 613 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, with Notes and Glossary, by FRANCIS J. CARMODY. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1947. (*University of California Publications in Modern Philology*. Volume XXXIII, No. 2, pp. 1-1v + 35-102, one figure in text.)

Professor Francis J. Carmody, who has already edited various didactic treatises in Old French and in Mediaeval Latin, now offers a partial edition of the Old French translation of a Latin tract. Leopold, son of the Duke of Austria, composed the *Compilatio de astrorum scientia* in 1271 or shortly thereafter. Quite modestly he disclaimed all originality "Let no one ask for the name of the author, since there have been several, not just one, I am merely their faithful and diligent compiler." The Latin text was published by the renowned printer Erhard Ratdolt at Venice in 1489. An anonymous French translation of it was made sometime before 1324. The terminus ad quem is absolute, because the first owner of the manuscript, Marie de Luxembourg, died in that year. This manuscript, now catalogued as Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français 613, has preserved the only extant copy of *Li Compilacions de le science des estoilles*.

The main stricture that a reviewer can make about this edition, admirable in many ways, is that it is incomplete. The justification offered for stopping at Book III is that the other books are as-



trological rather than astronomical. Only a complete edition would enable the reader to appraise the enthusiastic descriptions of the French translation: "With the sole exception of Alfonso el Sabio's *Libros del Saber de Astronomia*, the most extensive known treatment of this science in the vernacular. . . . More interesting than the Latin original, especially for its intricate vocabulary" (pages 37 and 45). Now the addition of the other books would hardly have doubled the size of this short monograph; in fact, one wonders (because of the description given on page 48) whether Books IX and X have been preserved at all. Be that as it may, the paucity of scientific allusions to the many manuscripts or to the printed text of the *Compilatio* and the fact, indicated clearly by the editor himself, that many of the technical terms found in *Li Compilacions* had been used by Hagin le Junf in 1273, make the reader chary about sharing the editor's enthusiasm. Inasmuch as Hagin was dealing primarily with judicial astrology, it is quite plausible that the vocabulary of the unedited portion bears a striking similarity to that of the portion now passing in review.

Hagin's translation of Abraham ibn Ezra exists in two manuscripts, which are mentioned by Carmody and which are preserved in the fonds français of the Bibliothèque Nationale. The original bears the call-number 24276, of which a rotograph copy is owned by the University of Illinois. On page 51 it is said to contain also Abû Ma'shar's *Nativités*. It would be more accurate to say that folios 100v-103v contain only the first sixth of it. The treatise is entirely lacking in the copy of that manuscript, which was made by Viennot Pingot in Paris in 1477 and which now bears the call-number 1351. Then again, Carmody notes (on page 48) that, in the omnibus manuscript 613, *Li Compilacions* is followed immediately by *Les Jugemens des estoilles*, of which the first part is reproduced in MS. 1352, and also by *L'Introductoire d'astronomie*, which was composed ca. 1270 and which is preserved also in MS. 1353 (cited indirectly in note 47 and on page 50). His reference to the precession of the equinoxes in the latter work shows that its author was dependent upon Ptolemy.<sup>1</sup> His frequent mentions of manuscript sources amounts to a comprehensive catalogue of astrological treatises in Old French.

Recently critical editions were made of the Old Italian and Old Dutch adaptations of *Le Livre de Sidrach*. Carmody comments, on page 39, that the Old French text has not been edited since 1528. His plea for a modern edition may be answered soon by one of Professor Holmes's students, Miss H. S. Treanor, who is using three manuscripts and two fragments. As for Nicole Oresme's translation in 1360 of *Le Quadripartit de Ptolomee*, for which Carmody was forced to consult manuscripts (on page 47), it is

<sup>1</sup> Cf. U. T. Holmes, Jr., *History of Old French Literature* (New York, 1937), p. 243.

heartening to learn that Professor A. D. Menut has gone abroad to complete an edition of it. Carmody gives the same date of 1360 (on page iv) for Jean de Corbichon's translation of *Le Propriétaire des choses* par Barthélemy de Glanville, but in the title of the incunabulum of it,<sup>2</sup> one finds "l'an de grace 1372." Carmody consulted the J. Pierpont Morgan MS. in New York, yet one may borrow a microfilm of the Brussels MS. from the Modern Language Association.

On that same page iv, he lists his sigla. They do not follow any pattern consistently, and they were hardly devised for mnemonic effect. Nor do the numerous abbreviations added in the glossary facilitate the comprehension of the intricate vocabulary of technical terms in various languages. I wish to add several minor suggestions in the hope that they may enhance a bit the serviceableness of this welcome edition.

The extensive bibliography is up-to-date with a few exceptions in note 8, for a recent allusion to Richard de Fournival's *Bibliomanie*, cf *Isis*, xxxvii (1947), p. 154, in note 52, which concerns the enigmatic Bethem, cf *Isis*, xxxv (1944), p. 299, in note 55, anent the well known Arnoul de Quinquempoix, cf E. Wickersheimer, *Dictionnaire biographique des médecins en France au moyen âge*, I (Paris, 1936), p. 52. I guess that the reading *mustees* on page 50 is a repetition of an error for *muscees* used adjectively in the sense of "secret." There need be no difficulty about interpreting a passage on page 63, apparently *cumchiement d'ordure* is found in the manuscript as *cûchiement d'ordure*, the Latin original *inquinatio* solves the problem, and reminds one of the obscenity in *Le Livre des Machabees*: "E comanda que lor armes fussent conchiees de totes ordures et de chonchiementz."<sup>3</sup> A query is raised as to whether *escu* on page 67 means "whip" or "horse;" it is equated with Latin *scuicua*, *scutica*, *stutica* and with Germanic *stut*. I venture to suggest the Latin equivalent *scutata*, and to see in *escu* the obvious meaning of "shield." This representation of "Uns hons juvenes en le main du quel il a un escu" can be compared with that of *Le Commencement de sapience*: "Un fort qui a un glaive en sa mein senestre."<sup>4</sup> The word *hautaiche* on page 77 eluded Carmody, who wonders if it is an error; the context makes it clear that "le souveraine hautaiche" denotes the upper altitude or the zenith.<sup>5</sup> The references given on pages 93 as 1—2—112-4—8—15 should be reduced to a single reference 1—4—15. On page 96 *ennap* "goblet" can not serve as the translation of *navis*, and the paleographic emendation, proposed on page 69, is unnecessary, the Latin original for *ennap* might be *vas*, while *navis* merely proves that "li nachele Argon" signifies the constellation Argo Navis. Finally the line in the glossary on page 100, which reads "*repus* adj 1—3—1 (*occultus*) probably for *repous* from *repandre*," can be deleted by recalling the numerous examples in Old French literature of *repus* as the past participle of *repondre*.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>2</sup> L. Thorndike, *Dates in Intellectual History: The Fourteenth Century* (New York, 1945), p. 44.

<sup>3</sup> E. Goerlich, *Die Beiden Bucher der Makkabaer* (Halle am Salle, 1888), I, 51.

<sup>4</sup> *The Johns Hopkins Studies in Rom. Lit. and Lang.*, extra volume xiv (1939), 41.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 94.

<sup>6</sup> Godefroy, vii, 63a. The use of this word in MS. 1353 deluded P. Duhem, *Le Système du monde*, III (Paris, 1915), p. 150.

The general impression to be derived from a perusal of the printed text is that Books I and II emphasize astronomy, while the Prologue and Book III put the accent on astrology. The opinion of Dr. George Sarton<sup>7</sup> that the Middle Ages did not draw a sharp line between science and superstition is confirmed fully by the definition of astrology and of astronomy given by Leopold himself. It is reproduced here on page 37 in Latin, with the remark that it was quoted long ago by Conradus Noricus, and on page 56 in Old French. Since the same fusion may be anticipated in the unpublished books, historians of science and French philologists will be very grateful to Professor Carmody if he will apply his erudition and his perspicacity to make accessible the entire text of *Li Compilacions de le science des estoilles*.<sup>8</sup>

RAPHAEL LEVY

The University of Texas

---

*Poèmes.* Par PIERRE DE RONSARD, Choisis et commentés par A. BARBIER. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946. Pp. xx + 204.

*Sonnets pour Hélène.* Par PIERRE DE RONSARD. Edition critique publiée par JACQUES LAVAUD. Paris: Droz, 1947. Pp. xxiv + 157.

La publication d'une anthologie pose immédiatement la question suivante: le choix des pièces retenues se justifie-t-il? Quel est le but poursuivi par le compilateur? Ce dernier a-t-il voulu donner une idée de l'ensemble de la production ronsardienne, ou bien a-t-il cherché à dégager et à mettre en lumière les poèmes qui lui plaisaient le plus? Est-ce d'histoire littéraire ou d'esthétique qu'il s'agit? Ou bien encore a-t-il été possible de concilier ces deux disciplines?

Quand Sainte-Beuve publia les *Œuvres Choises de Pierre de Ronsard*, c'était avec l'intention de réhabiliter le maître de la Pléiade. 'Avec la sagacité du critique et du poète,' dit L. Moland, Sainte-Beuve 'avait, dans l'œuvre touffue du vieux lyrique, recueilli la fleur, l'élite, [. . .] ce qui mérite de devenir plus ou moins classique.' Et Sainte-Beuve, lui-même, déclara, dans la

<sup>7</sup> *Introduction to the History of Science*. From Rabbi Ben Ezra to Roger Bacon, II (Baltimore, 1931), p. 760, cf. Carmody, *Progress Med. Rev Studies U. S.*, XVIII (1944), p. 23.

<sup>8</sup> Chronologically it is related to Nicolas de La Horbe's translation of the astrological treatises, which Guido de Bonatti had composed in Latin in the thirteenth century. The statement (made on page 40 and repeated on page 44) that the *Livre nommé introduction* was not translated into a modern language until the fifteenth century rests upon the date of the Arsenal MS., not upon the year of composition, which is given as 1327 in *Hist. lit. Fr.*, XXIV (1862), 485, and XXXV (1921), 630.

préface de 1828 : 'J'ose espérer que le choix qu'on va lire sera définitif.' Cet espoir ne fut pas déçu. Les recueils des œuvres de Ronsard qu'on a donnés depuis imitent plus ou moins, en effet, celui du grand critique. Les éditeurs qui se sont succédé ont bien pu ajouter ou retrancher telle ou telle pièce, ou donner à leur anthologie plus de développement, mais le travail de Sainte-Beuve a servi de base aux nouvelles compilations. C'est ainsi qu'Alphonse Siché a suivi son devancier, tout en réduisant le nombre des poèmes choisis par Sainte-Beuve et en ajoutant les deux sonnets 'libres' de Ronsard. L. Becq de Fouquières et A. Noël ont joint, aux pièces traditionnellement transmises, des extraits de la *Franciade* et des *Mascarades*. H. Longnon a conçu les deux volumes de *La Fleur des Poésies et des Musiciens de Ronsard* 'pour faire mieux connaître, pour faire chanter, pour faire aimer le Prince des Poètes français.' P. de Nolhac a donné un ouvrage plus ample que celui de Sainte-Beuve et il a placé les pièces dans un ordre original : 'Le choix,' a-t-il dit, 'a été guidé surtout par des raisons de goût littéraire, quelquefois par l'intérêt historique, très rarement par la pure curiosité.'

M. Barbier a recueilli quelques-unes des pièces des *Amours* de 1552 sur lesquelles l'attention avait déjà été attirée et il y a joint des sonnets moins connus mais qui sont tous intéressants. Il a réduit le nombre des pièces de la *Continuation des Amours* et il a négligé celles des *Sonnets et Madrigals pour Astrée*. Par contre, il a donné une place importante aux *Sonnets pour Hélène*. Mais, ce qui nous paraît moins satisfaisant, c'est le nombre des pages qu'il a consacrées aux odes comme aux discours et aux élégies. Quant aux hymnes, ce sont évidemment des poèmes curieux ; mais ils contiennent des longueurs. N'était-il donc pas possible de détacher, de ces hymnes, des épisodes ; de citer des extraits, de relever de beaux vers et de laisser le reste ? Mais c'est là affaire de goût. Le choix qu'on peut faire des œuvres de Ronsard dépend de l'opinion qu'on a de son art. Si l'on croit avec Gérard de Nerval que la Pléiade a triomphé 'dans tous les genres de poésie gracieuse et légère,' on cherchera à rassembler les petites odes de Ronsard qui 'semblent la plupart inspirées plutôt par les chansons du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle' ; on gardera ses sonnets et quelques-unes de ses élégies, les pièces où 'l'imitation classique est moins sensible' ; on délaissera les compositions où Ronsard a voulu introduire 'tous ces noms de déités grecques qui passent au peuple, pour qui est faite la poésie, pour autant de galimatias, de barbarismes et de paroles de grimoire,' comme l'a écrit Chapelain dans une lettre à Balzac (27 mai 1640).

Disons aussi qu'on aurait pu désirer que M. Barbier eût retenu les pages où Ronsard a exprimé ses idées sur la poésie. Déjà Sainte-Beuve, qui n'avait donné aucun échantillon des vers de la *Franciade*, avait publié des extraits de la seconde 'Préface,' et L. Moland y avait ajouté l'*Abrégé de l'art poétique français*. Remarquons encore que, dans le travail curieux et intéressant qu'il a consacré à

*Cassandre ou le secret de Ronsard*, M. Sorg avait attiré l'attention sur l'année 1543, date à laquelle Ronsard reçut la tonsure. C'est par le récit de cet événement que M. Barbier commence l'histoire de la vie du poète, sans, d'ailleurs, accepter toutes les thèses de M. Sorg, et sans, non plus, citer le livre de ce dernier. M. Barbier n'a pas davantage, dans sa bibliographie, signalé la thèse de A.-M. Schmidt sur *La poésie scientifique en France au seizième siècle* (Paris, 1938).

L'excellente édition critique<sup>1</sup> que donne M. Lavaud est précédée d'une introduction sur laquelle nous voudrions dire quelques mots. M. Lavaud cite, en l'approuvant, un passage de la seconde édition de la *Vie de Ronsard* par Claude Binet où celui-ci déclare que Ronsard s'est aidé du nom d'Hélène de Surgères, 'de sa vertu et de sa beauté pour embellir ses vers, et luy a cette gentille Damoiselle servy de blanc, pour viser et non pour tirer ou atteindre.' Et M. Lavaud me semble avoir exprimé une opinion fort juste quand il a dit des relations de Ronsard et d'Hélène: 'Cette liaison, à vrai dire, comme la plupart des *Amours* chantées par les poètes de l'époque, semble n'avoir guère été qu'un jeu poétique.' Ronsard 'est-il devenu réellement, sincèrement amoureux d'Hélène? Nous ne le savons pas, et nous ne pouvons pas le savoir. Peu importe, d'ailleurs. Tout ce que Ronsard a mis d'émotion dans *Hélène*, c'est dans son amour pour la vie, pour la beauté, pour l'amour lui-même qu'il faut le rechercher.' Que pouvons-nous, en effet, demander aux œuvres poétiques de ce temps? Non pas de nous donner des renseignements, assez incertains, sur les aventures amoureuses de leurs auteurs, mais bien plutôt de créer en nous un état poétique.

MARCEL FRANÇON

Harvard University

---

*The Works of Claude Boyer.* By CLARA CARNELSON BRODY. New York: King's Crown Press, 1947. Pp. iv + 167.

Some dissertations make substantial contributions to knowledge, others are accepted because of the training their composition is supposed to have given to the student. This book belongs in the latter class, except for the fourteen pages on the author's life and

<sup>1</sup> Nous regrettons que M. Lavaud n'ait pu citer, dans sa bibliographie, l'ouvrage fondamental de Mr James Hutton, *The Greek Anthology in France* (Ithaca, 1946). M. R. Sorg (*Cassandre*, Paris, 1925, p. 235-6) avait publié deux sonnets qu'il prétendait avoir été écrits, l'un par Ronsard, l'autre par Hélène. Mr. H. C. Lancaster (*RHL*, xxxvi (1929), 574-6, puis dans *Adventures of a Literary Historian*, Baltimore, 1942, p. 166-73) a montré d'une façon qui paraît définitive, que ces sonnets doivent être attribués respectivement à Claude Billard et à Mme de Retz. M. Lavaud, qui avait soutenu le point de vue de M. Sorg dans son *Philippe Desportes* (Paris, Droz, 1936, p. 517-20), doit être félicité de n'avoir pas publié le premier de ces poèmes dans son édition des *Sonnets pour Hélène*.

the sixteen in which his one opera and his non-dramatic verses are discussed. The author devotes almost a third of the remaining pages, over forty of them, to analyzing plays that have already been analyzed. She prides herself on the detail into which she goes, but her analyses would have been more effective if they had been succinct. Nor is the tedium they create alleviated by her strange use in them of the past tense where most scholars would use the present. She also discusses sources that have already been pointed out and adds comments that do little to further knowledge of Boyer. She may even obscure such knowledge by the uncritical manner in which she weighs evidence.

She accepts, for instance, statements made about Boyer's *Judith* in a novel by Lesage that the frères Parfaict quote, and consequently calls this tragedy a "striking failure," a "sudden failure," a "failure almost over night," though she could easily have learned from the *registres* of the Comédie Française that Lesage was mainly guided by his imagination. He says that the play was acted throughout Lent, though, before Easter, it was produced only from March 4 to 18; he declares that its publication caused its failure on the stage, though it was printed too late to justify this conclusion;<sup>1</sup> and he states that it was suddenly dropped, although after Easter it followed the normal course of tragedies, was acted nine times, and was not withdrawn until two of its productions earned less than 350 francs each. It was even given once the following year. To trust a novel in this connection is to mislead the reader.

She sometimes forgets to indicate her own sources and shows so little knowledge of some of them that on p. 158 she mentions a play as attributed to Boyer "by Soleinne in his *Bibliothèque dramatique*," to an anonymous author by "Mahelot." The professor who read her manuscript and whom she never mentions might well have told her that Soleinne was dead when Paul Lacroix catalogued his library, that the list of plays to which she refers was probably not drawn up by Mahelot, and that, as the list names 71 plays and only one author, it is without value in this connection.

Occasionally Dr. Brody seeks to elucidate a problem. I had suggested that *Antigone*, a tragedy that has survived only in manuscript, might be the *Thébaïde* attributed to Boyer by Furetière. Dr. Brody comments (p. 159):

The interjection "Ha" was used almost indiscriminately by enough characters in the play to suggest that it was a favorite expression of the author, but it was an interjection that was hardly ever, if at all, used by any of the characters in any of Boyer's plays

She is unaware of the fact that "ha" was used interchangeably with "ah" in the seventeenth century.<sup>2</sup> It was so employed by the

<sup>1</sup> This was pointed out by Fournel, as Dr. Brody notes, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Littré, s. v. *ha*.

author of *Antigone* and may have appeared in the manuscript of Boyer's published plays. *Antigone* has 13 examples of *ha*, 17 of *ah*, while Boyer's printed *Agamemnon* gives 40 examples of *ah*, many of which may originally have been *ha*. Until Boyer's manuscripts are discovered, no such stylistic argument ought to be advanced.

On pp 66 and 72 she finds two of Boyer's plots "artificial" because a father and a son love the same woman. I wonder what she thinks of Racine's *Mithridate*. On p 116 she suggests that Corneille's *Andromède* was influenced by Boyer's *Ulysse*, without taking into consideration what Corneille must have owed to the Italian *Orfeo* that Mazarin had patronized. The date given on p 97, l 23, should be 1665, not 1655. I refrain from indicating other misprints except in the case of the word *impostor*, twice spelled *imposter* on p 40, twice *impostor* on p 41, and, on p. 43, both ways in a single sentence!

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

*The 'Courtisane' in the French Theatre from Hugo to Becque (1831-1885).* By SIDNEY D. BRAUN. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1947. Pp. 157. \$2.50 (The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, Extra Volume XXII).

*Victor Hugo's Acted Dramas and the Contemporary Press.* By WILLIAM D. PENDELL. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1947. Pp. 135. \$2.50. (The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, Extra Volume XXIII).

Dr. Braun's study was undertaken as a dissertation, although this volume excludes his material on the *théâtre libre*. There is no previous survey of adequate extent dealing with the courtesan in drama; this one covers the field as nearly completely as the need justifies.

In accordance with the author's purpose in showing social and dramatic evolution, the chapter division is according to the classification of the women and the name popularly given each class. Unfortunately, although the author is careful with his terms, the actual distinctions between *lorette*, *cocotte*, and *demi-mondaine* are often doubtful, and the individual differences are greater than the generic ones. Thus the author must show each type as having many of the characteristics already established for preceding ones, and the reader may feel that he has circled back to material of some previous chapter. The *grisette* stands out as a distinct portrayal. The author admits that she is not necessarily venal, but rightly includes her. There is less warrant for including Lucrece Borgia, for Hugo attributes venality only to her mother.

An attempt to trace through dictionaries the pejorative change in the meaning of *demi-mondaine* seems to me futile. The word was probably used almost immediately as a conscious euphemism and misused soon thereafter. The inexact use was inevitable; it is the decline of the exact use that might be significant.

There is little of value here for the study of the dramatists themselves, concerning them the author quotes critical opinions rather uncritically. On p. 21 he apparently approves Petit de Juleville's statement that Hugo "ne laissait subsister rien de pur que dans les âmes les plus corrompues"—an understandable reaction, but not a true statement. On p. 118 Waxman's designation of *L'Enfant prodigue* as a completely typical *vaudeville* is accepted along with one from Chandler which obviously means that it was not. Reading Arnaoutovitch should have convinced the author that Becque had little in common with Taine and evolutionism. But when the study passes from general comment on Becque to his portrayal of the courtesan, it is more convincing and shows accurately the contrast between Becque's treatment and that of his predecessors.

In sum, the author makes his point: he shows that there were changes in the portrayal of the venal woman at different periods of the century, and that they reflected real social changes. He makes their nature fairly clear. He shows the wide range of plays and characters involved, and yet the limited range of its dramatic treatment before Becque. The conclusions are not surprising, but they are now based on the first careful examination of the field. The study includes a good bibliography and a useful list of plays.

Dr. Pendell's volume is a thoroughly successful presentation of the contemporary critical reaction to Hugo's plays; in fact, it does rather more than the author claims and goes far toward evoking the general atmosphere in which the plays were produced.

As the author states, previous records of the criticism of the press, including the opinions quoted in the definitive edition of Hugo's works, are inadequate, both in extent and in the nature of the passages selected. After comparison with this work, one can see that there has hitherto been too much concern with the temperature of the criticisms and too little with their content. Dr. Pendell has been interested in the standards by which Hugo was judged, the details of the criticism, and whether it was just or unjust. He usually lets the more obvious injustices condemn themselves, but takes pains to show, when necessary, the point to each allusion, to sift the frequent charges of plagiarism, and to serve as a discriminating referee.

That there was much bias will surprise no one; what may be more surprising is to find that many of the attacks condemned Hugo's practice, sincerely or not, on the basis of the theories of the *Préface de Cromwell*. Moreover, despite all partisanship, some of this criticism was valid and discerning and merits rescue from ob-



scurity not only as exemplifying contemporary attitudes but as criticism in its own right.

An error on p. 39 attributes to Act I of *Hernani* what was really a reference to Act III.

The bibliography is slight for books, but extensive and excellent for the articles on which the study is based.

The book seems the definitive one on its subject, and is one of some importance for all students of Hugo or of the nineteenth-century French theater. It has the further merit of being quite well written.

GIRDLER B. FITCH

*The Citadel*

*Essays by Sir William Cornwallis, the Younger.* Edited by DON CAMERON ALLEN. *The Oslerian Texts, I.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1946. Pp. xxiii + 265. \$4.75.

Sir William Cornwallis, the Younger, the first real English essayist, has deserved better treatment than he has received by historians of English literature and the compilers of such biographical collections as the *DNB*. The glaring inaccuracies in the account of Cornwallis in the latter have been corrected, and much new information concerning Cornwallis's life has been discovered, in the last twenty years by Professor R. E. Bennett, Mr. P. B. Whitt, and Mr. C. E. Avery. Professor Allen now gives us for the first time a scholarly edition of Cornwallis's fifty-two essays. It is the first of the *Oslerian Texts*, published by the Tudor and Stuart Club of the Johns Hopkins University in memory of Sir William Osler, Lady Grace Osler, and Edward Revere Osler. The basis of the new edition is the 1606 text of the first twenty-five essays (which were first published in 1600) and the 1610 text of the second group of twenty-seven essays, of which twenty-four were first published in 1601. There are a biographical and bibliographical introduction, tables of variants, and a commentary on Cornwallis's many quotations and allusions. The text of the *Essays*, which is in singularly bad condition, has been left intact except for the normalization of punctuation and capitals.

Cornwallis has been useful hitherto chiefly to literary historians as a *terminus a quo* for the English essay, and they have been indebted to him for several of the earliest definitions of the form. In his *Essays* he followed the lead of Montaigne, and is thus the true father of the discursive personal and familiar essay in English. The loose collections of jottings that made up the ten pieces in the first edition of Bacon's *Essays* in 1597 seem to have had no influence on Cornwallis. That he was no slavish imitator of Montaigne, however, has been convincingly shown by Professor Bennett. Cornwallis got from Montaigne some very helpful suggestions as to how

a young gentleman might set forth in an easy conversational manner his ideas on moral, social, and other subjects. The young Englishman was, indeed, most like Montaigne in that he expressed his convictions, often very different from those of his master, in as frankly egotistical and honest fashion as did the old Perigourdin gentleman himself. The charm of Cornwallis is that of young manliness, whereas Montaigne wins us with the mellow worldliness of Gallic old age.

Cornwallis probably had little formal education, was innocent of Greek and French (he knew Montaigne only in translation, whether by Florio or not is uncertain), but had a reading knowledge of Spanish and Italian. He had the amateur scholar's enthusiasm for books, and felt at home, as perhaps not every university man could have done, with the personages of classical history. "He played his game well," he says of Caesar. Of Cato he remarks, "this fellow sure was naturally good, but somewhat too well contented to be thought so." His reading was varied and without the benefit of academic guidance. He was young enough to revel in the sentimentousness of that "Prince of morality," Seneca, and to prefer the deeds of Alexander and Caesar to the "disease of words let in by Cicero." He had read rather more widely than most young gentlemen or scholars in his day in English literature. He refers to Chaucer and Stowe, and alludes to Shakespeare and other playwrights and to the romances and ballads. Sidney is his favorite, and he speaks with delight of "that masterpiece of English . . . the *Arcadia*." His own English style is, next to Nicholas Breton's perhaps, the most informal and conversational of his day, and he needs almost no annotations to be intelligible to the modern reader.

Cornwallis provides an interesting contrast with Bacon, who shares with him the honor of having started the English essay on its way. His essays "Of Love," "Of Suspicion," and "Of Friendship and Factions," for example, lack the dogmatic and didactic certainty of Bacon's essays on the same topics, as well as Bacon's cold, clear technique of analysis. He is much less given to apophthegms than Bacon, but he can turn a homely aphorism with the best of his contemporaries. "Fame never knew a perpetuall Bedpresser," he remarks in "Of Sleepe." "Leave us in durt, and finde us in durt," he says by way of summarizing his fellow countrymen in comparison with the noble Romans. "Every man musters himselfe in the band of Vertue when there is any pay to be taken, but at the day of battaile, . . . shee hath not a follower." "There is in the multitude a strength more than they know of."

Students of English manners and morals, of social and intellectual standards of the early seventeenth century, as well as of English letters, will find the reading of Cornwallis's *Essayes* in Professor Allen's new edition a profitable and pleasurable experience.

ALEXANDER M. WITHERSPOON

*Yale University*

*John Milton's Complete Poetical Works.* Reproduced in Photographic Facsimile. A Critical Text Edition Compiled and Edited by HARRIS FRANCIS FLETCHER. Volume II. Urbana, Illinois: The University of Illinois Press, 1945. Pp. 634. \$20.

Collectors, bibliographers, and students of Milton have long recognized the imperative need of a study of the text of the first edition of *Paradise Lost*. But until Professor Fletcher, no scholar has cared to undertake the onerous task: to solve the problem of assembling sufficient copies, or photographs of copies, to make his study definitive, to collate painstakingly this large number of copies, and finally, to analyze the complex of variants that the collation promised to reveal.

In helping Professor Fletcher in his undertaking, the University of Illinois has been signally generous. That he might have sufficient materials, the library acquired some fifty copies of the first edition (probably one-quarter of those still extant) and photographs of some one hundred additional copies. These materials Professor Fletcher has subjected to a scrutiny that noted even minute variations of type and type position, and his analysis of these and other differences has enabled him to reconstruct in considerable detail the conditions under which the edition was printed and bound, and to offer what appear to be adequate explanations for virtually every variant observed in the edition. In short, the collation in Part II of his study, "The Text of the First Edition," suggests that Professor Fletcher has done his best to justify the confidence and faith placed in him by the great institution that made his work possible.

Similar praise, however, cannot always be accorded Part I of his study. This 216 page "The Composition, Printing, and Publication of the First Edition" contains much extraneous material: Sections I-II, presenting Milton's early plans for an epic, have little, if any, place in an "intensive study" (p. 31) of a book printed in 1667; Section V belongs, at best, in an appendix; and much now in the text of Part I should have been relegated to footnotes. As a consequence, Part I is badly organized. It should properly begin with the material presented in Section IV, with Sections III and VI following; all fifteen sections often lack sufficient transition, cross reference, and significant summation; and paragraph and sentence structure is sometimes surprisingly amorphous. Part I, finally, is not always rigorously accurate<sup>1</sup>—a fact that unfortunately not only

<sup>1</sup> On p. 3, Professor Fletcher lists 54 original copies as having been used for collation; but in the subsequent classification of these copies according to title page (pp. 3-5), I find no mention of copies 49, 50, 51, 52, and 54, though p. 165 indicates the use of copy 50, pp. 130, 155, 169 show use of copy 52, and pp. 155, 212 of copy 54. Likewise missing from the classification is copy 70, referred to on p. 212. Pp. 168-69 seem to have been

casts doubt on Part II, but also renders a scrupulous appraisal of Professor Fletcher's volume virtually impossible, as complete facilities for checking are available only at the University of Illinois.

Since the ultimate text of Milton's epic is to be made from the second edition of the poem, controlled by the first and by the manuscript of Book I, there is yet opportunity for a discussion of the text of *Paradise Lost* in which Professor Fletcher may recapitulate much that he has presented badly in volume II of his work. One may hope, then, that in volume III he will add to his energy and industry the virtues of lucid exposition and irreproachable accuracy; for if he does so, his work could become—as volume II certainly will not—a model of textual scholarship.

MAURICE KELLEY

Princeton University

---

*The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1555* By MARVIN T. HERRICK. *Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, vol. XXXII, no. 1. University of Illinois Press, 1946. Pp. vii + 117. \$1.50.

Modern students who read the critical treatises in chronological order are apt to feel that Horace's *Ars Poetica* represents a distinct comedown from the excellence of Aristotle's *Poetics*. Though such studies as those by Rostagni and Klingner may serve to show them that the *Ars Poetica* has more to offer than is first apparent, they are likely to use whatever they find there as a means of better understanding the *Poetics*.

Not so the students of the Renaissance. As Marvin T. Herrick points out in this scholarly little book, the *Poetics* and *Rhetoric* of Aristotle were studied by the Renaissance commentators to throw light on Horace's poem. By expanding Horace's precepts with Aristotle's observations, they were largely responsible for the formation of sixteenth century criticism. Herrick's purpose is to show in detail when and how this process took place. He declares that

written before certain copies were assigned their present numbers, as 111 is cited as 101, 113 as 103, and 132 as 122. Pp. 3, 5 assign copy 12 the 1669<sup>a</sup> title page; p. 140 reads 1669<sup>a</sup>. Four of the six figures of the table on p. 208 disagree with the totals to be computed from pp. 3-5. Other inaccuracies and omissions include p. 4: "IU" omitted from the library number of copy 53; p. 5 "(Imperfect.)" omitted from the second description of copy 39; p. 152: [L13v] omitted before line number 450, 450 printed in the wrong font, and the readings of 9-968 and 982 reversed, as pp. 153, 566-69 clearly show; p. 153: the discussion of [Oo3r] omits the variant "pray|pray,"; p. 169: "G 1158" should read "G 11558" if p. 5 is correct; p. 207 "Ss[r]" should read "Ss2[r]" unless the following line number (10.980 ff.) is incorrect; p. 214: "153-55" should read "152-55"

between 1533 and 1555 the main lines of Renaissance criticism had been laid by such commentators and paraphrasers as Denores, Willchius, Philippus, Madius, and Robertellus.

Actually, Herrick does not stay strictly within the dates given in the title. He makes considerable use of the 1482 commentary on the *Ars Poetica* by Landinus, and the commentary of Lambinus which did not appear until 1561, as well as that of Aldus Manutius Paulus which was published in 1576. Good reasons for these departures may, however, be found in the text. Landinus is used to show how the commentators before the rediscovery of Aristotle used Cicero and the grammarians to interpret Horace. Lambinus and the younger Manutius do not push the dates forward, thinks Herrick, because they are propagating interpretations made by 1555. The quotations from other writers—one is as late as 1924—are used as illustrations of how the opinions formed in the first half of the sixteenth century are echoed later. These illustrations contribute to the interest of this treatise and might well have been expanded into a history of these critical ideas. Indeed, expansion all along the line would have made this book, which teaches but does not always delight, more readable.

Herrick's chapters, which are entitled "Nature and Art," "Poetic Imitation," "The Function of Poetry," "Decorum," "Epic Poetry vs. Tragedy," and "The Dramatic 'Rules,'" show more fully than has ever been shown before how many of the precepts which were handed down to the following generations under the names of Minturno, Scaliger, and Castelvetro may be found in the commentators with whom he deals. For instance, we are shown that except for unity of place all of the so-called rules of the drama had been hinted at, if not fully clarified, by 1555. Thus, Herrick, feels able to conclude that "nearly all the critical precepts that are familiar to students of literary criticism of the late sixteenth, seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries are to be found in these Horatian commentaries. . . ."

To the unwary this sentence might mean both less and more than the author seemingly intended it to mean. It does not merely restate what has long been known: that the Renaissance and Neo-Classical critics borrowed their critical terminology from the ancients, since Herrick's commentators have already begun the process of making these precepts fit the needs of the new civilization. Aristotle's remarks on the difference between the characters of comedy and those of tragedy, for example, are already interpreted by them as demanding a class distinction between these genres. On the other hand, this statement of Herrick's might be interpreted as implying that the later critics are less worth our study than had hitherto been supposed. Such an interpretation would be dangerous. Much of what is most characteristic of Renaissance criticism finds no place in these Horatian commentators. In the chapter on

Epic Poetry vs. Tragedy there is no mention of the romances, no discussion of the allowability of modern subjects and Christian machinery; in other words, no mention of the problems which really agitated the Renaissance when it considered the "long poem," the problems that Spenser and Milton had to consider before they could write the *Faerie Queene* and *Paradise Lost*.

Students of Renaissance criticism will be grateful to Herrick not only for showing how much of the spadework had been done by the lesser known commentators before the great critical treatises were published, but for shedding more light on the relations of the criticism of the Renaissance with that of Greece and Rome.

VERNON HALL, JR.

Dartmouth College

*A Bibliography of the Theophrastian Character in English.* By CHESTER NOYES GREENOUGH. Prepared for Publication by J. MILTON FRENCH. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947. Pp. xii + 347. \$10.00.

*The Theophrastian Character in England to 1642.* By BENJAMIN BOYCE. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947. Pp. ix + 324. \$5.00.

With the first volume, Miss Murphy's bibliography of the English character is vastly enlarged and extended both forward and backward in time. Professor Greenough found his earliest "characters" in 1495 and his latest in 1931; between these dates he uncovered them by the thousands and he has indicated their residence by arranging the titles in chronological order. Under the first listing, one finds an analysis of each book and all the necessary bibliographical impedimenta; additions and emendations are indicated at all subsequent chronological stops. The contents of Earle's "W. S. for Ed: Blount" edition are, for example, enumerated under 1628; the augmentations of the so-called "fift Edition" are mentioned under 1629. The volume is, consequently, bibliographically sound and it is made extraordinarily useful by subject, title, and author indexes.

Professor Boyce's book, which is based on Professor Greenough's notes, is a running commentary on the earlier part of the bibliography. There is first a survey of the "character" in ancient times and an account of the blending of that tradition with the native tradition which is older than Chaucer. Then there are pauses on the "character" according to Hall and Overbury and a good account of the theory and vogue of the "character" prior to the *Micro-cosmographie* of Earle. Boyce also discusses the use of the

"character" in sermons and suggests how widely spread the fashion became after Overbury's successful book. He gives ample illustrations and quotations that supplement Aldington's anthology which is now long out of print.

We are amazed to discover how wide this passion for "characters" became and how generously they were used. Preachers like Thomas Adams pop them into sermons; repentants like William Fennor drop them into autobiographies. Everyone seemed to try his hand, but only a few—Earle and Overbury—really succeed. By the middle of the seventeenth century, the "character" became a vehicle of political or ecclesiastical propaganda and controversy, and the number of "characters" of Quakers, Dissenters, Agitators, True Britons, etc. that fluttered from the presses makes dull the imagination. Behind some of these "characters," however, we feel the glow of reality, and it is not long until the "portrait character" (known best to literary students in the sketches of Clarendon or in the *Characters of the Royal Family* by Defoe) emerges. So by one course, the early "characters" of Hall, Overbury, and Earle lead to Steele, and Addison, and the novel, and by another way they are metamorphosed into interpretive biography.

It is unfortunate that Professor Greenough did not live to see his life's work in print; but he found excellent and modest helpers in Professors French and Boyce, who brought all of his material together, checked and revised it, and saw it through the press. No teacher could ask for a greater tribute. It is, of course, needless to add that Harvard Press has come up to its usual typographical excellence in the printing of both books.

D. C. A.

---

*Jorge Guillén: Cántico.* By JOAQUÍN CASALDUERO. Santiago de Chile: Cruz del Sur, 1946. Pp. 181.

Joaquín Casaldüero has produced another excellent book in his study of Jorge Guillén's *Cántico*, a penetrating and subtle analysis of the meaning and the form of the work of an original and truly creative contemporary poet. Guillén is a poet more renowned than read, more admired than understood. Casaldüero knows and understands *Cántico* as few people do. The passive reader seeking an easy guide to *Cántico*, however, will derive little from the present work, for Casaldüero the critic writes for the same public as Guillén the poet: he is as terse and exact in expression, as sure in his handling of abstractions; indeed there could not be a happier meeting of critic and poet. Casaldüero's method of criticism is so simple as to be extremely difficult and rare: he does not "interpret" a book, he merely endeavors to see and understand exactly what is in it, what the author intended to do, how and why and to what effect.

All his books of criticism have dealt with authors very conscious of their craft, rich in both content and form: Cervantes, Galdós, Bécquer, Guillén. Not only in his analyses of ideas and emotions and their relation to form, but in his syntheses, in his grasp of a work as a whole, do we observe his profound insight and his broad culture.

*Jorge Guillén: Cántico*, a deceptively short book, is divided into two parts, which correspond roughly to the first two editions of *Cántico*, 1928 and 1936 (the Mexican edition of 1945 had not been published when this book was written, but it loses none of its value thereby). Here Casaldueiro brings together in concisely logical exposition the ideas, concepts and attitudes dispersed throughout *Cántico*, emphasizing constantly Guillén's insistence on embracing reality in its totality with its essential unity, order, concreteness, simplicity, clarity, its "forma viva"; the apprehension of it by means of the senses; the poet's resultant delight in being, and his attitude of vigorous affirmation. He analyzes brilliantly and in detail the contribution of form and rhythm to the emotions expressed (notably in a masterly study of "Salvación de la Primavera," pp. 149-157 and 175-178). And he situates this poetry in its relation to that of preceding periods—especially Impressionism—and the opposite pole of contemporary poetry, Surrealism, to the other arts, and to the whole history of ideas.

Casaldueiro underlines consistently the aspects of Jorge Guillén and *Cántico* which set them apart from other poets and other poetry. He stresses the complete and conscious interdependence of form and content. He insists also on the warmth of emotion and expression of *Cántico*. And he stresses repeatedly the creative power of Jorge Guillén, his complete mastery over form (not as an end in itself but as a means of expression), his constant imposition of his will—through the medium of hard work—on his material, words, to create a poetry rich in spiritual and human as well as esthetic values. Casaldueiro does all this with an intelligence, warmth, logic and insight all too seldom found in a critic. His book is a fine tribute to a fine poet.

RUTH WHITTREDGE

Wellesley College

---

*Shakespeare's Sonnets: Their Relation to His Life.* By BARBARA A. MACKENZIE. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Limited, 1946. Pp. x + 82.

After a rather thoroughgoing new re-shuffling of the order of the sonnets as first printed in 1609, the author of this monograph finds that they tell a coherent story of the nature and development of Shakespeare's relationship with Southampton, with the "Dark



Lady," with three different "rival poets" (Barnabe Barnes, Nash, and Gervase Markham), and with various persons and incidents which affected his life and work during the probable period of his sonnet-writing (late 1591 or early 1592 to early summer of 1596). Only when the sonnets have been rearranged does the story become coherent; yet the necessary changes must be based upon considerations of "substance and sentiment" as well as of "style" (p. ix). Here, therefore, a certain circularity seems undeniable. But Dr. Mackenzie has been careful to assert that much of what she offers is "a conjectural, imaginative construction" (p. vii). She gives pivotal importance to the "upstart crow" passage in *Greenes Groatsworth of Wit*, finding not merely that the attack is reflected in a specific group of consecutive sonnets (71, 72, 111, 112, 29, and 37, autumn, 1592) but also that it had a deep and lasting influence on the poet and his art. In the sonnets here read as immediate reactions to Greene's attack, indeed, "the man Shakespeare comes alive" for Dr. Mackenzie: "here is no myth, no dramatic creation, but humanity in the living flesh" (p. 22); and the story, from this point onward is undeniably full, vivid, and original. But the Shakespeare who comes alive—here abjectly losing all confidence in his own poetic powers as a result of the publication of Greene's pamphlet, subsequently confused or lost in a whole series of absurdly school-girlish passions and petty fears and jealousies—is neither attractive nor entirely credible; nor does the story that Dr. Mackenzie tells seem consistent with her assertion that, in these poems, "we have to deal simply with a passionate friendship, unsullied by any taint of perversion" (p. x).

To insure the complete independence of her own findings, Dr. Mackenzie "sedulously and deliberately avoided consulting the conclusions reached by other recent critics in the field . . . such as Tucker Brooke and the late J. A. Fort" (p. v). Probably this policy also explains the absence of any mention whatever of the *New Variorum Sonnets*, edited by Hyder Rollins and published in 1944.

C. HINMAN

---

*Minor Knickerbockers: Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes* (AWS). By KENDALL B. TAFT. New York: American Book Co., 1947. Pp. cxlviii + 410. \$2.50.

Even though the major "Knickerbocker" writers (Irving, Cooper, and Bryant) are excluded from treatment in this volume, no other book contains such helpful and abundant information about the literary history of New York City during the very active period 1807-1837 as the 110-page "Introduction" to this anthology,

the twenty-fifth now available in the American Writers Series; and no readily accessible book contains such comprehensive bibliographical information on the subject as does the thirty-seven-page "Selected Bibliography" (annotated) here available. These features would thoroughly justify the book even if there were no edited selections.

During the period covered by *Minor Knickerbockers* (1807-1837) New York (with over 80,000 people at the beginning and over 300,000 at the end) was the self-conscious literary and publishing as well as commercial center of our young country. For a time after this period New England was to play the leading part in our national literature. Of the twenty-seven New York writers included in this anthology, fourteen are given reasonably extensive representation—such authors as Paulding, Woodworth, Halleck, Payne, Drake, and Willis. An attempt is made by the editor, both in the text and in the informative footnotes, to describe the social, political, economic, and cultural context of these twenty-seven writers. Fortunately, this purpose is greatly aided by frequent citations from contemporary memoirs, diaries (like that of Philip Hone), and periodical accounts, as well as condensed information from such comprehensive modern studies as Odell's *Annals of the New York Stage*. There may be a tendency, here and there, however, to take too readily at face value facts and figures from contemporary memoirs and periodicals, notably given to exaggeration, especially of circulation figures. These same sources, on the other hand, provide information for the best section of the "Introduction": that surveying literary criticism in periodicals during the period and emphasizing the unusual stress in New York on such values of literature as amusement, escape, information, and enjoyment of craftsmanship.

In spite of the long helpful "Introduction" to this volume, the literary history of early nineteenth-century New York remains to be written. With this scholarly essay and the theses, biographies, bibliographies, and indexes to periodical literature now available, the time should not be long off before we may expect such a cultural history.

HERMAN E. SPIVEY

*University of Florida*

---

## BRIEF MENTION

---

*James Russell Lowell*. HARRY H. CLARK and NORMAN FOERSTER, eds. American Writers Series. New York: American Book Co., 1947. Pp. clxvi + 498. \$2.50. The only fair way to mention this volume—number 24 in the American Writers Series—is to say that it represents, perhaps, the culmination of a body of studies that is without

names of the authors cited in Section III. Some of her selections seem capricious. Why the Carcassonne ed. of the *Lettres Persanes* and not Barckhausen's? Why is no mention made of Samsam's little book: *L'Iran dans la littérature française*? And why begin with travels as source material with the year 1600 and not with Pierre Belon's fascinating *Observations de plusieurs singularitez et choses mémorables trouvées en Grèce, Asie, Judée, Egypte, Arabie, et autres pays estranges* . . . 1553. It is not difficult to find lacunae in a work of such magnitude and I wish in no way to minimize the value of Miss Dufrenoy's painstaking effort for which all those interested in literary history and the history of ideas will be extremely grateful.

EMILE MALAKIS

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

---

FOOTNOTE ON CALDERÓN, RAVENSCROFT, AND BOURSALT. At the risk of boring the reader, I should like to point out certain misstatements or misinterpretations in Mr. Lancaster's reply<sup>1</sup> to my note<sup>2</sup> on the source of Ravenscroft's *Wrangling Lovers*, and, with my foot thus in the door, to add a comment or two of my own.

Mr. Lancaster states that my conclusions are based, in part, "on the fact that Boursault called his novel a 'Traduction Espagnole.'" <sup>3</sup> Examination of my note will reveal that, while Boursault's own statement is mentioned, it forms no part of the evidence on which my conclusions are based.

Mr. Lancaster states further that I have submitted "as evidence four cases in which . . . [I think] that details given in the Spanish novel have been preserved in three of Calderón's plays and by Ravenscroft, and not by Boursault" <sup>4</sup> This statement is correct of only my first *three* cases; the fourth concerns details given in both Calderón, Ravenscroft, and Boursault.

It is true, as Mr. Lancaster has noted,<sup>4</sup> that my hypothesis is based on a refusal to admit that the evidence I presented could be explained away as coincidence. Let us examine for a moment Mr. Lancaster's rebuttal for the theory of coincidence. He says, first of all, ". . . yet if I had space enough I could submit examples of coincidence, not borrowing, much more striking than these Mr. Rundle cites" <sup>5</sup> I have heard this device used many times by schoolboys, who will often use mythical older brothers to bolster them in an altercation, but I was not aware that it had crept into the repertoire of either nineteenth or twentieth century literary scholars.

---

<sup>1</sup> *MLN* June, 1947, LXII, pp. 382-389.

<sup>2</sup> P. 385

<sup>3</sup> P. 386.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* As far as space is concerned, Mr. Lancaster could have had plenty had he not gone off to tilt windmills. He takes up over half a page (pp

Having discharged his blank cartridge, Mr. Lancaster now loads his gun with shot but, for some strange reason, imagines he brings down my game by shooting at right angles to it. His contention that my "entire hypothesis . . . depends upon the assumption that Ravenscroft did not imitate Boursault" is completely erroneous. Even had we proof positive that Ravenscroft was using Boursault,<sup>6</sup> the similarities between Ravenscroft and Calderón would still point to a source used by both of the latter—in that case, to the Spanish novel as an *additional* source for Ravenscroft.

The entire matter of Ravenscroft's use of a Spanish novel does depend, then, on whether my evidence is to be regarded as coincidence. I doubt that so considering it would fare very well in the mathematics department. I don't know exactly what the odds against three such "coincidences" would be, but I'm sure the figures—like those concerning the Shakespearean sonnet, the monkeys, and the typewriter—would be too astronomical for mundane application.

Of course, as Mr. Lancaster re-dresses my points, they are considerably changed. Naturally, two fathers could, in separate works, think of writing letters—but my entire point was that both Calderón and Ravenscroft had

---

387-8) to prove that, in general, Ravenscroft is nearer to Boursault than to Calderón—a thing I would have no reason or occasion to deny, a thing quite beside any point I had made.

<sup>6</sup>Mr. Lancaster's evidence for this (pp 386-7) is interesting but not entirely convincing. (1) He assumes that the Spanish name would be Ordoño. Might it not have been Ordgano, as in Ravenscroft? Boursault's use of the name would then be as near the Spanish as is Ordgano to Ordogno. Moreover, why assume that Ravenscroft, who knew French, would need a French midwife for the letter *g*? (2) Benevent is a perfectly natural English shortening of Benevente. (3) The figure is not "sixty and fourteen ducates," as Mr. Lancaster represents it, but "twenty seven thousand, nine hundred sixty and fourteen ducates"—a different matter Ravenscroft's shop-keeper, who rolls out this sum, is impressed by it and wishes to impress Gusman. Ravenscroft, though not the best playwright of the period, certainly knew that the sum of sixty and fourteen is seventy-four. Obviously, he kept the circumlocution only for effect. Might not the Spanish novelist have been contriving the same effect by a device which is no more foreign to his language than to English? (4) As for the "*adieu Jusqu' au revoir*," I cannot understand the logic of Mr. Lancaster's comment, "one can hardly suppose that the Spanish novelist dropped into French at this point." Quite obviously, there could have been short French (or Italian) passages scattered *throughout* the Spanish novel, any one of which in Ravenscroft's retention would have seemed a transcription from Boursault. (5) I do not care to hazard a guess as to whether or not an unknown Spaniard would dare refer to the Inquisition in a comic passage; Mr. Lancaster's comment does suggest an interesting possible reason for the novel's disappearance.

them writing at *exactly* the same point in *exactly* the same story—and that is an entirely different matter. So, also, it *might* occur to Ravenscroft to have Diego stay Sanco until he had read a letter, but Mr. Lancaster conveniently forgets<sup>7</sup> that almost exactly the same words are used at this point by Calderón and Ravenscroft. And so on. In summing my points, Mr. Lancaster has used a sort of reverse alchemy, an art upon which scientists have long frowned.

Indeed, should I follow Mr. Lancaster's advice to emulate Mandoce and search for the lost *Señorita Novela*, I believe I should prefer that Mr. Lancaster not accompany me. I fear that, should we find the lady, he might, before I could speak to her, declare her to be not *Señorita Novela* at all but her French cousin, *Mademoiselle Nouvelle*, and send her home to write letters in a cool closet. So once again I would be shipwrecked—by a coincidence.

J. U. RUNDLE

*Indiana University*

---

REPLY. I regret that I made Mr. Rundle's case less feeble than it really is. I assumed that he was following Langbaine, whose reason for holding that Ravenscroft imitated a Spanish novel was that an English translation of Boursault, which he did not recognize as such, is called a "Pleasant Spanish History Faithfully Translated."<sup>1</sup> Mr. Rundle now makes it clear that he is relying purely on the slight resemblances he has discovered between Calderón and Ravenscroft. These appear striking to him because they occur at "exactly the same point in exactly the same story." Unfortunately the stories told by the Englishman and the Spaniard are not exactly the same, and Ravenscroft's version is much nearer to Boursault's than it is to Calderón's. It means little that in Ravenscroft and Calderón a man tells a valet to wait till he has read a letter and a girl declares that her father is in the habit of writing in a room, since the situations, the persons, the letter, and the room are all in Boursault's novel. Yet it is on this slight evidence that Mr. Rundle would have us believe that a Spanish novel was important enough to be imitated by Calderón, Boursault, and Ravenscroft, though it is now unknown even by name, and the still more astonishing hypothesis that traces of the lost Spanish novel are better preserved in the English version than in the French, in Boursault's novel than in plays by Calderón!

I regard his findings as coincidences, but, if I considered them otherwise, I would take them as evidence that Ravenscroft imitated Calderón in addition to Boursault. This supposition is, however, rejected by Mr. Rundle. He clings to Langbaine's theory of the Spanish novel, though he fails to use what Langbaine submitted as evidence and though he offers

---

<sup>7</sup> P. 386.

<sup>1</sup> My other statement, incorrect though to my opponent's advantage, could not have misled the reader, for I quoted the passages from Calderón and Ravenscroft on the same page (386), a fact that Mr. Rundle fails to mention.

nothing to show that the mysterious source was a novel rather than a play, or even that it was written in Spanish.

In his fifth note he holds that, in devoting half a page to showing that Ravenscroft is nearer to Boursault than he is to Calderón, I was "tilting at windmills," but this was a quite necessary part of my refutation. As a matter of fact I was tilting at Mr. Rundle. If he wishes to identify himself with a windmill, I will not protest.

In his sixth note he supposes that his unknown novelist called a valet Ordgano. Can he find such a name anywhere in Spanish literature? I think not. It is much more easily understood as a misspelling of Boursault's Ordogno. The Spanish name is not Benevente, as Mr. Rundle gives it, but Benavente. In Ravenscroft's play it is Benevent, exactly the spelling employed by Boursault. "Twenty-seven thousand, nine hundred sixty and fourteen ducates," with the final emphasis on the small number fourteen, is not, as Mr. Rundle supposes, a stronger expression than "Twenty-seven thousand, nine hundred and seventy-four." It is obvious that Ravenscroft is translating Boursault's "vingt-sept mille neuf cens soixante & quatorze." However, the whole note is beside the point as Mr. Rundle is now willing to admit the possibility that Ravenscroft used Boursault in addition to the lost novel.

Mr. Rundle implies that I was bluffing when I said I could give more striking examples of coincidence than those he refuses to admit as such. Here is one that far surpasses those concerned with the letter and the writing-room. Brieux's *Berceau* treats the subject of marital difficulties that arise when a woman has had a child by her first husband, has divorced him, has remarried, and has had no child by the second. So does Hervieu's *Dédale*. In both plays contact is reestablished between the heroine and her first husband by the illness of their child. In both plays the heroine was originally named Laurence. Hervieu had a character named Virieu; Brieux, one named Girieu. Brieux's play was completed before the other and was being rehearsed when Hervieu first told the director of the Comédie Française about his own play. Hervieu had previously known nothing about the rival production. It was Brieux who gave me this information, although it would have been to his advantage to appear to have been imitated by Hervieu, who was obliged to change his heroine's name and to make other alterations in order to prevent persons with the outlook of Mr. Rundle from accusing him of plagiarism.

In return for my comparing Mr. Rundle's pursuit of a nameless Spanish novel with a valet's search for a nameless Spanish lady, he becomes quite playful and insinuates that I have been influenced in this discussion by the fact that my field is French, but this insinuation is most unjust, for I trace the whole business back to Calderón, while Mr. Rundle deprives the Spanish dramatist of this distinction.

In conclusion I must apologize to the readers of *MLN* for devoting so much space to this subject. I can offer as an excuse for publishing Mr. Rundle's articles only the fact that they were directed against myself.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume LXIII

APRIL, 1948

Number 4

---

## MORE ABOUT MARK TWAIN'S WAR WITH ENGLISH CRITICS OF AMERICA

In his superb article "Mark Twain's *A Connecticut Yankee: A Genetic Study*"<sup>1</sup> Professor John B. Hoben traces Mark Twain's growing anti-English feeling in the 1870's and '80's which culminated in *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court*. This satire upon undemocratic English institutions was mainly due, as Professor Hoben convincingly demonstrates, to Twain's irritation over Matthew Arnold's criticism of American civilization. With Hoben's main contentions all Twain critics will probably agree. I wish here merely to add a few supplementary notes to his article and to disagree with him on a few minor points.

In the first place, I think it should be pointed out that A. B. Paine fully realized the bearing of the Arnold controversy upon the satire of the English in *A Connecticut Yankee*. Paine discusses Twain's irritation over Arnold's criticism of America, tells of the MSS. Twain wrote to defend American institutions and attack English institutions, and adds that Twain decided not to publish his MSS. at that time but to get to work again on the MS. of *A Connecticut Yankee* and use its hero as a mouthpiece to express his doctrines.<sup>2</sup> Paine closes his discussion with this statement.

He even defended American newspapers, which he had himself more than once violently assailed for misreporting him and for other journalistic shortcomings, and he bitterly denounced every shaky British institution, touched upon every weak spot in hereditary rule. He did not print—not then—he was writing mainly for relief—without success, however, for he only kindled the fires of his indignation. He was at Quarry Farm and

---

<sup>1</sup> *American Literature*, XVIII (November, 1946), 197-218. Professor Hoben has read scores of unpublished documents in the Mark Twain papers, and this gives his article much additional value and authority.

<sup>2</sup> A. B. Paine, *Mark Twain: A Biography*, II, 758-9, 840-1, 873-4.

he plunged into his neglected story—*A Yankee in King Arthur's Court*—and made his astonishing hero the mouthpiece of his doctrines. He worked with an inspiration and energy born of his ferocity.<sup>3</sup>

Hoben quoted most of this passage in his article<sup>4</sup> but omitted the last two sentences. They state the thesis, however, which Hoben's article defends

In his account of Twain's growing anti-English feeling Hoben overlooks a relevant chapter in *A Tramp Abroad*, dismisses *The Prince and the Pauper* too lightly, and omits entirely the violent blast at kings and nobles in *Huckleberry Finn*. In *A Tramp Abroad* (1880) the chapter entitled "Queer European Manners"<sup>5</sup> is partly a retaliation for jibes at American manners, which Twain says are "the standing butt for the jests of critical and polished Europe." Among other things he says that a woman may safely walk unattended on the street of an American city, whereas if she walks without an escort on the streets of London she will be insulted—and not by low-life characters either, but by well-dressed men who pass for gentlemen. He admits that Americans may be less polished than Europeans, but he believes that they are kinder and more humane.

Hoben dismisses *The Prince and the Pauper* in two sentences:

In spite of his strong equalitarian message in *The Prince and the Pauper* (1881), kingship is not questioned. Edward VI is merely a better monarch for having worn the pauper's rags.<sup>6</sup>

Although *The Prince and the Pauper* has now become mainly a book for children, it was written for adults and contains both direct and indirect satire and attacks many evils. If kingship is not questioned directly, it is satirized indirectly and is made to appear both ridiculous and unjust. If Edward VI is praised for his mercy and justice, his father, Henry VIII, is condemned for his cruelty, brutality, and injustice. One is reminded of *A Connecticut Yankee* when reading a number of details and incidents in *The Prince and the Pauper*: the burning of Anne Askew and three men at the stake; the poverty and crime in Offal Court; the impossibility of distinguishing between the pauper and the prince except by their clothing; Henry VIII's determination that his son shall reign even if he is mad; the great hereditary post

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 873-874.

<sup>4</sup> P. 211.

<sup>5</sup> Vol. II, Ch. XVIII.

<sup>6</sup> P. 204.



of Diaperer to the Prince of Wales, held by an earl; the four hundred officials and servants who took care of the prince (though there was no hereditary nose scratcher); the widespread ignorance, superstition, and cruelty in all ranks; the human heads on London Bridge; the ludicrous ceremony of dressing a prince; the rarity of merciful and generous impulses among the nobility; the absolute powers of kings and noblemen over the lives of people who live in their domains, the cruel methods of inflicting the death penalty, often upon innocent people; the burning of women suspected of witchcraft or known to be Baptists; the strange ways of royalty ("all the ways of royalty are strange"); the whipping-boy who takes the prince's punishments; the harsh and tyrannical laws; the inhuman punishments for petty crimes, the unfair trials and flimsy evidence that often condemned innocent persons; the conditions in the prison under Sir Hugh Hendon's castle; and the absence of freedom of speech and of the press. Many of these details have counterparts in *A Connecticut Yankee*. In the latter the evils condemned are frequently said to persist down to modern times, whereas in *The Prince and the Pauper* the direct references are usually limited to the sixteenth century. But in the notes Twain stresses the fact that harsh and tyrannical laws persisted in England<sup>7</sup> long after comparatively humane and kindly codes had been established in Connecticut.<sup>8</sup>

Huckleberry Finn's sweeping indictment of kings is too well known to require anything more than a reminder here. He enjoyed heaping contempt upon them. He thought them all bad, "a mighty ornery lot." He also said that servants in England were not treated better than Americans treated Negro slaves. "A servant ain't nobody there. They treat them worse than dogs." In these attacks upon kings and the bad treatment of servants in England Huck is, to a considerable degree, merely the mouthpiece of Mark Twain.

Beyond a doubt *Huckleberry Finn* (December, 1884) played a

<sup>7</sup> In *Following the Equator* (Vol. I, Ch. x) Twain says they persisted far into the nineteenth century.

<sup>8</sup> See Bernard DeVoto's interpretation and criticism of *The Prince and the Pauper* in *Mark Twain's America* (Boston, 1932), pp 269 ff. He says the book "might have been called 'A Missouri Democrat in the Court of Edward VI.'" It was an attempt to write the story of the Boss before the possibilities of the idea were clear to Mark Twain." He believes that "its purpose was to expose the evils of Tudor England, with as much of their modern perpetuation as could be managed."

part in Twain's war with foreign critics in the 1880's. Since it was published over a year before he began *A Connecticut Yankee*,<sup>9</sup> and since he had already been angered by English critics of America, it would be surprising if—as Hoben maintains—the first three chapters of *A Connecticut Yankee* differed radically in tone and attitude from the remainder of the book. Hoben believes that the first three chapters contain only sentimental romance, that at the time of their composition Twain intended to write “a romance in which his chivalric devotion and his lofty literary purpose anticipated the spirit of *Joan of Arc*,” and that satire appears first in Chapter iv.<sup>10</sup> I think it extremely unlikely that Twain would at any time in his life have written about medieval knights in the spirit of *Joan of Arc*. His attitude toward the Maid of Orleans was one of religious adoration. On the other hand, as early as 1870 he satirized the “so-called ‘chivalry’ of the Middle Ages” as absurd and brutal and called the medieval knight “a braggart, a ruffian, a fantastic vagabond, and an ignoramus.” In the same article he said that if those old knights performed their exploits today, only “a New York jury and the insanity plea could save them from hanging.”<sup>11</sup> Twain's irritation over Arnold's criticism of America caused him to satirize modern England, but he would have satirized the age when knighthood was in flower in any case.<sup>12</sup>

The first three chapters of *A Connecticut Yankee* do not read like “a romance in which his chivalric devotion and his lofty literary purpose anticipated the spirit of *Joan of Arc*.” Chapter I reveals the miserable condition of the common people in Arthur's realm. In Chapter II Twain describes a dinner of the Round Table. There were about twice as many dogs as men, and the knights and ladies got as much delight out of the dog fights as did the people in the “one-horse town” in Arkansas where old Boggs got killed. They were “a childlike and innocent lot; telling lies of the state-

<sup>9</sup> He began it in 1886, wrote a few chapters, and then put the manuscript aside. Two years later he took it up again.

<sup>10</sup> See Hoben, pp. 200-203.

<sup>11</sup> See Twain's “The Tournament in A. D. 1870,” in the *Galaxy* for July, 1870. See also Twain's vigorous attack on Scott and his ideas of chivalry in *Life on the Mississippi*.

<sup>12</sup> I think Hoben was misled by the letter Twain wrote to Mrs. A. W. Fairbanks on November 16, 1886. See Hoben, p. 200. Even if Twain saw some fine qualities in Malory's “great and beautiful characters,” he thought them stupid and ridiculous nevertheless.

hest pattern . . . and ready and willing to listen to anybody else's lie, and believe it, too. It was hard to associate them with anything cruel or dreadful; and yet they dealt in tales of blood and suffering with a guileless relish that made me almost forget to shudder." Twenty or more prisoners were present, "maimed, hacked, carved, in a frightful way." Their hair, faces, and clothing were caked with blood, and no one gave them the comfort of a wash or a lotion for their wounds.

Chapter III satirizes the murderous adventures of knights, the duels between strangers fought by "these big boobies." The word *boobies* is applied to Arthur and the knights of the Round Table.

Yet there was something very engaging about these great simple-hearted creatures, something attractive and lovable. There did not seem to be brains enough in the entire nursery, so to speak, to bait a fish-hook with; but you didn't seem to mind that, after a little, because you soon saw that brains were not needed in a society like that, and indeed would have marred it, hindered it, spoiled its symmetry—perhaps rendered its existence impossible.

The big lie Sir Kay tells about Sir Launcelot's adventures, the flirtation between the Queen and Sir Launcelot "that would have got him shot in Arkansas, to a dead certainty," the boring yarn of that "mighty liar and magician" Merlin which puts everyone to sleep, the rats that swarm over the sleeping knights, the rat that nibbles cheese on King Arthur's head and dribbles crumbs in his face with "impudent irreverence"—all these things are in Chapter III. Surely Hoben is mistaken about the radical difference he finds between the first three chapters and the remainder of the book.

Both Paine<sup>13</sup> and Hoben<sup>14</sup> point out that Twain used in *The American Claimant* (1892) a part of an article which Twain had written earlier to defend the American press against Arnold's attack upon it. It might be added that, in a limited way, *The American Claimant* carries on Twain's attack upon undemocratic English institutions. In Chapter x, at the meeting of the Mechanics' Club in Washington, D. C., Parker read the essay defending the American press against the charge of irreverence. In the audience was a young Englishman, the son of an earl, who had decided to renounce his hereditary privileges and live in the United States "as just a man." He had come to hold "all hereditary lordships and

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, 873 n.

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 208 and 209.

privilege to be usurpation, all nobility a tinsel sham, all aristocratic institutions a fraud, all inequalities in rank a legalized crime and an infamy."<sup>15</sup> He was pleased by the discussion of the American press, and his thoughts ran thus:

I'm glad I came to this country. . . . I was right to seek out a land where such healthy principles and theories are in men's hearts and minds. Think of the innumerable slaveries imposed by misplaced reverence! . . . If you can get a man to reverence your ideals, he's your slave. Oh, yes, in all the ages the peoples of Europe have been diligently taught to avoid reasoning about the shams of monarchy and nobility, been taught to avoid examining them, been taught to reverence them. . . . For ages, any expression of so-called irreverence from their lips has been sin and crime. The sham and swindle of all this is apparent the moment one reflects that he is himself the only legitimately qualified judge of what *is* entitled to reverence. . . .<sup>16</sup>

In his talks with an American named Barrow, the young English nobleman is led to see that in Europe the caste system could not survive if the people were less servile and refused to *knuckle down*.

I think I realize that caste does not exist and cannot exist except by common consent of the masses outside of its limits. I thought caste created itself and perpetuated itself; but it seems quite true that it only creates itself, and is perpetuated by the people whom it despises, and who can dissolve it at any time by assuming its mere sign-names themselves.<sup>17</sup>

Barrow agrees:

It's what I think. There isn't any power on earth that can prevent England's thirty millions from electing themselves dukes and duchesses tomorrow and calling themselves so. And within six months all the former dukes and duchesses would have retired from the business. I wish they'd try that. Royalty itself couldn't survive such a process. A handful of frowners against thirty million laughers in a state of eruption. Why, it's Herculaneum against Vesuvius; it would take another eighteen centuries to find that Herculaneum after the cataclysm.<sup>18</sup>

This is just another example of Twain's oft-repeated assertion that the people can at any time free themselves of oppression or insulting distinctions if they will.

<sup>15</sup> Chapter I. The earl attributes the opinions to an English radical, but the earl's son admits that they are his opinions too.

<sup>16</sup> Chapter X.

<sup>17</sup> Chapter XI.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

Hoben says that Twain tries to be fair in his satire of the English in *A Connecticut Yankee*. That is notably true in *The American Claimant*. Twain does not pretend that Americans are perfect. The satire of the English is nearly counterbalanced by the satire of Americans: they worship a lord and they are obsequious to prosperity and position. Twain makes it clear that in his opinion most Americans—like Colonel Sellers, the American claimant—would accept unearned honors, wealth, and deference if they could get them. Moreover, the young English nobleman undergoes a change of heart and decides that he was a fool to give up his wealth, position, and rank. He marries the daughter of Colonel Sellers and returns to England. This does not mean that Twain changed his mind about aristocracy. Far from it. It means, in the first place, that he thought most men selfish and willing to enjoy what other men could not have. Moreover, one earl, by voluntarily giving up his title, could not abolish the system. Only the people could do that, and for the good of all he thought that no one should have rank and inherited honors which he had not earned and from which others were irrevocably shut out. Like Barrow, he thought the "all-powerful and stupid mass" of a nation should not allow "the infamy, the outrage, the insult of a hereditary aristocracy" to exist.<sup>19</sup>

Hoben did well to point out that Twain was pro-English both at the beginning and at the end of his career. In *Following the Equator* (1897) he criticized England's earlier colonial policies in Australia and New Zealand, and he sympathized with the Boers. He also combined humor and satire in his remark <sup>20</sup> that the English are mentioned in the Bible: "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." But at the turn of the century he protested more violently against our war upon the Filipinos than he had ever protested against the imperialism of England. Moreover, he thought the imperialism of England far less evil than that of Germany or Russia. Twain liked the English in spite of his aversion to some of their undemocratic institutions, and the English liked him and enjoyed most of his books except *A Connecticut Yankee*. When Oxford conferred an honorary doctor's degree upon him in 1907, it was the proudest moment of his life, and the enthusiastic re-

<sup>19</sup> Chapter XIV.

<sup>20</sup> In *Pudd'nhead Wilson's New Calendar*.

ception that he received from men and women of all ranks and conditions on that last visit to England surpassed any ovation he had ever received even in America.

D. M. McKEITHAN

*University of Texas*

---

## JULIUS CAESAR AND THE TOWER OF LONDON

Shakespeare refers twice to the tradition that Julius Caesar built the Tower of London. In *Richard III* (III 1. 68-74) Buckingham satisfies the curiosity of Prince Edward on the point, and in *Richard II* the deposed king meets his queen for the last time as he is being conducted to "Julius Caesar's ill-erected tower" (v. i. 2). The editors of these plays have alluded somewhat vaguely to a medieval tradition, without citing evidence of its existence before Shakespeare's time.<sup>1</sup> But that the tradition was, for Shakespeare, not merely an oral one is attested by the passage in *Richard III*, in which Buckingham assures the young prince that it is "upon record."

None of the chronicles printed in the Rolls Series contains any reference to the tradition; for one reason or another the major historians rejected it. Among most of the earlier historians, the chief reason was, perhaps, that Geoffrey of Monmouth had made no mention of a tower built by Caesar in Trinovantum; while the sixteenth-century chroniclers who distrusted Geoffrey seem to have eschewed the tradition that Caesar built the Tower because the accounts of the conquest of Britain in the *Commentaries* and other Roman writings do not justify the story. Polydore Vergil, relating the dethronement of Eliodorus the Pious by his treacherous brothers, says that he was committed "to prison in that place which is now called the Towre, as yeat there remaininge; the which being well embateled with manie turrets, whereof it hathe the name, the vulgars surmise to have been erected by Julius Caesar, whoe, indeed, made noe mention of London, bie cause he cam not thither."<sup>2</sup> Lambard, in his *Perrambulation of Kent* (1576, sg.

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted for this information to Dr. M. W. Black of the University of Pennsylvania, who suggested the subject of this article.

<sup>2</sup> Sir Henry Ellis (ed.), *Polydore Vergil's English History, from an Early Translation* (Camden Society, O. S. vol. 36, 1846), p. 40.

Oo III), likewise rejects the tradition because he has not "hitherto read any such thing, eyther in *Caesars* own Commentaries, or in any other credible Hystorie." And Stow says, in his *Survey of London*.

To begin therefore with the most famous Tower of London, . . . it hath beene the common opinion and some haue written (but of none assured ground) that *Iulius Caesar*, the first conquerour of the Brytains, was the originall Authour and founder aswell thereof, as also of many other Towers, Castels, and great buildings within this Realme but (as I haue already before noted) [*marg* In my annales] *Caesar* remained not here so long, nor had hee in his head any such matter, but onely to dispatch a conquest of this barbarous Countrey, and to pceede to greater matters. Neither do the Romane writers make mention of any such buildings erected by him here.<sup>3</sup>

It is clear from Polydore Vergil's remark that the Tower was thought to have had its origin in a pre-Roman building. Leland, Richard White, Richard Harvey, Holinshed, and Strype, the expander of Stow, for example, attributed it to Belinus, whom Geoffrey had named as the builder of both Billingsgate and a near-by tower.<sup>4</sup> But other writers, especially poets, antiquaries, and popularizers of history, found the association of the Tower with Julius Caesar irresistible; for there were several works in which it was "upon record" before Shakespeare's day.

The earliest of these so far unearthed are the French prose *Scalacronica* of Sir Thomas Gray (begun 1355), which says that after conquering Britain, Caesar spent the winter there and "*fist fere en le hor la toure de Loundres, qui plus pooit fair en vn sesoun! que nul autre en x. foiz taunt,*" and *The Parlement of the Thre Ages*, a dream poem of the fourteenth-century alliterative revival which says of Caesar. "The true toure of londone yn his time he made."<sup>5</sup> Since Gray's *en le hor* makes sense in its context, while the "in his time" of the *Parlement* does not, the implication is that the author of the latter borrowed from Gray.

<sup>3</sup> Ed Charles L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1908), I, 44. See also I, 136.

<sup>4</sup> Action Griscom (ed.), *The Historia Regum Britanniae of Geoffrey of Monmouth* (London, 1929), p. 291. See John Lewis, *History of Great Britain* (1729), sg. O., Richard Harvey, *Philadelphus* (1595), sg. G., Holinshed's *Chronicles* (London, 1807), I, 456, and *A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster: . . . By John Stow . . . Corrected, Improved, and . . . Enlarged . . . By John Strype* (London, 1720), I, 4.

<sup>5</sup> I am indebted to Dr. W. J. Roach of the University of Pennsylvania for

Next in point of time is Lydgate's *Serpent of Division*, a prose life of Caesar written in 1422. In his *Serpent* Lydgate says that "in signe of this conqvest and famous victory [over the Britons], Iulius Cesar edefied in his londe dyuerse Castelis & Citees, for a perpetuall memorye to putte his name in remembraunce," among them being the Tower of London.<sup>6</sup> Lydgate's work is extant in four MSS, and was printed in three editions which Shakespeare could have seen: one of uncertain date printed by Treveris, another issued in 1559, and a third published with *Gorboduc* in 1590.

The *Anonymi Chronicon Godstovianum* (ed. Thomas Hearne, with Roper's *More*, 1716), which dates from the reign of Henry VI, states that Caesar "fecit unam turrin in turri London" (sg. Bb<sup>v</sup>). The *Cronycullys of Englonde*, dating from the reign of Edward IV, attributes the whole Tower to Caesar. Besides notes and insertions by other hands, the MS of the *Cronycullys* (Lambeth 306) contains on its blank leaves copious memoranda by Stow, to whom it seems at one time to have belonged.<sup>7</sup> The *Cronycullys*, then, must have been one of the writings which Stow refuted in his *Survey of London*, though it is likely that his old enemy Grafton was his chief target.

Grafton quotes the Lydgate passage, cited above, in his *Chronicle at Large* (1569, sg. F iv<sup>v</sup>). Since Grafton names the author and title of his source in this passage, Shakespeare could have had the *Chronicle at Large* in mind, without anachronism, in making Buckingham state that the tradition is "upon record." With respect to other references to Caesar's Tower in writings between Buckingham's time and Shakespeare's, however, we might wonder whether an anachronism involving the chronology of historiography is of the sort Shakespeare would have been likely to commit. Besides the one in Grafton's chronicle and those already quoted from Polydore Vergil, Lambard, and Stow, references after the reign of Richard III include those in the *Historia Regum Angliae* of the

helping me to decipher the Gray passage. The first part of the *Scala Cronica* has never been printed complete; I have used a microfilm of MS Corpus Christi, Cambridge, 133. *The Parlement of the Thre Ages*, extant in two MSS, was edited by Israel Gollancz for the Roxburghe Club (1897).

<sup>6</sup> Henry N. MacCracken (ed.), *The Serpent of Division* (London & New Haven, 1911), p. 51.

<sup>7</sup> James Gairdner (ed.), *Three Fifteenth-Century Chronicles* (Camden Society, N. S. vol. 28, 1880), p. iv.



Warwickshire antiquary William Rous (or Rosse), in Dunbar's *Treatise of London* (stanza 5), in two documents relating to repairs made to the Tower during the reign of Henry VIII,<sup>8</sup> in Peele's *Edward the First*, in the anonymous play of *Sir Thomas More* (i. e., in the original text, not in the additions attributed to Shakespeare and others), in Deloney's *Thomas of Reading*, in a marginal note of William Slatyer's verse *History of Great Britanie* (sg. l<sup>3</sup>), and in Taylor the Water Poet's *Memoriell of All the English Monarchs* (under "Cassibelan").<sup>9</sup> Possibly all of these but the last three and Stew's *Survey of London* antedate Shakespeare's *Richard III*; but while it is impossible to determine what kind of anachronism Shakespeare would have avoided, it is difficult to believe that any of these works was uppermost in his mind when he wrote Buckingham's remark. It is likely that he was thinking of Lydgate's statement, as it appears in one of the three printings of the *Serpent* or in Grafton's *Chronicle*.

As for the origin of the tradition, the evidence at hand suggests two possibilities. One is that the tradition is based on historical fact. One writer has suggested that the title Caesar's Tower, "supposing the existence of a Roman Tower, may have been bestowed, without any reference to the original invader of Britain, upon the edifice, in honour of the contemporary Caesar, or presumed heir to the empire, at the time of its erection," the Caesar having later been identified with the most famous person of that name.<sup>10</sup> A more recent authority finds stronger justification for the attribution, since "the Roman wall built by Julius Caesar round London" had its southeast corner quite close to this spot [the Salt

<sup>8</sup> Extracts from these are printed in the appendix to vol. 1 of the first edition of John Bayley's *History and Antiquities of the Tower of London* (London, 1821).

<sup>9</sup> The references in Peele, More, and Deloney are cited in Sugden's *Topographical Dictionary to the Works of Shakespeare and His Fellow Dramatists* (Manchester, 1925), p. 520. Those in Dunbar and Polydore Vergil are cited in Hans Matter, *Englische Grundungssagen von Geoffrey of Monmouth bis zur Renaissance* (Heidelberg, 1922), p. 359.

<sup>10</sup> John W. Archer, *Vestiges of Old London* (London, 1851), sect. xv, p. 3. Some older opinions concerning the Roman origin of the Tower are discussed in Bayley's *History and Antiquities of the Tower of London* (1821), pp. 1-6. See also William Kent, *London for Shakespeare Lovers* (London, 1934), p. 94.

Tower], and very possibly Julius Caesar had a tower to flank the two faces of it at, or very near, this spot."<sup>11</sup>

The other possibility is that some medieval purveyor of history misread a passage in his source. It has been suggested that the "Dodres" which Gervase of Tilbury wrote for "Odnea" (a place in France where Geoffrey says Caesar built a tower) was misread as "Londres."<sup>12</sup> Another type of passage which might have been misread is that in which both Caesar and the Tower are mentioned by coincidence. One such passage appears in William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, which says of William Rufus:

Et profecto, si Christianitas nostra pateretur, sicut olim anima Euforbii transisse dicta est in Pythagoram Samium, ita possit dici quod anima Iulii Caesaris transierit in regem Willelmum

Unum aedificium, et ipsum permaximum, domum in Londonia incepit et perfecit, non parcens expensis dummodo liberalitatis suae magnificentiam exhiberet<sup>13</sup>

It is conceivable that some writer with small Latin, or one reading hastily, might have understood from this passage that Caesar built the Tower. Another passage which might have been misread appears in Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*. Having described the founding of Trinovantum by Brutus, Geoffrey adds:

At postquam Iud frater Cassibellani qui cum Iuliano Cesare dimicavit regni gubernaculum adeptus est cinxit eam nobilissimis muris necnon & turribus mira arte fabricatis.<sup>14</sup>

The example of Lazamon's citation of sources in the *Brut* makes it tempting to consider one of these passages a more than possible source of the Caesar tradition.<sup>15</sup>

Whatever the origin of the story, it persisted after Shakespeare's

<sup>11</sup> Sir George Younghusband, *Tower of London from Within* (revised ed., New York, [1925?]), p. 48.

<sup>12</sup> Matter, *Englische Grundungssagen*, p. 358.

<sup>13</sup> Ed. Thomas D. Hardy (London, 1840), II, 504. Vague as it is, the second sentence of this passage seems to have started the tradition that Rufus built the Tower (see Hardy, II, 504 n.), despite the statement of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle that he only built a wall around it. It is possible that William of Malmesbury was referring to Rufus' hall in Westminster, but his phrase "in Londonia" would suggest the Tower to most readers.

<sup>14</sup> Ed. Acton Griscom (London, 1929), p. 252.

<sup>15</sup> See Sir Frederic Madden (ed.), *Lazamon's Brut* (London, 1847), I, xii.

time at least into the eighteenth century. A scholarly allusion to it appears in Hearne's edition of Leland's *Collectanea*,<sup>16</sup> and Gray apostrophizes "Ye Towers of Julius! London's lasting shame" in *The Bard*.<sup>17</sup> It is interesting that one of the first and the last instances of the tradition at hand should occur in poems. Although the story seems seldom to have commended itself to the sober historian, it held a certain fascination for writers of a more fanciful bent, among them the greatest of English poets

HOMER NEARING, JR.

*Pennsylvania Military College*

---

"TWENTY GOOD-NIGHTS"—*THE KNIGHT OF THE  
BURNING PESTLE AND MIDDLETON'S  
FAMILY OF LOVE*

In *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, II, i, 69-70, Humphrey takes leave of Venturewell with the couplet:

Good-night, twenty good-nights, & twenty more,  
And 20 more good-nights,—that makes three score

Emil Koeppel<sup>1</sup> in 1895 suggested that the couplet was intended to ridicule the frequent repetition of the words *Good night* in the Garden scene of *Romeo and Juliet*, II, ii ("Sweet, good-night!" l. 120; "Good-night, good-night!" l. 123; "Three words, dear Romeo, and good-night indeed!" l. 142; "A thousand times good-night!" l. 155; "Good-night, good-night. Parting is such sweet sorrow That I shall say good-night till it be morrow," ll. 185-6); and most modern editors have merely repeated Koeppel's suggestion without venturing an independent opinion. Although Beaumont may well have had in mind *Romeo and Juliet*—and possibly a number of other plays—there seems hardly sufficient reason to assume that his ridicule was specifically directed toward

<sup>16</sup> In the edition of 1774 Leland's sketch of a tower and the editorial note concerning its identity are in vol III, p. 431.

<sup>17</sup> Cited by Hudson (ed.) *King Richard II*, in *The Works of Shakespeare* (Boston, 1852), v 117 n

<sup>1</sup> *Quellen Studien zu den Dramen Ben Jonson's, John Marston's, und Beaumont und Fletcher's* (*Munchener Beiträge zur romanischen und englischen Philologie*, XI), p. 43.

*Romeo and Juliet*. I suspect it much more likely to have been directed toward a play more immediately antedating the composition of his burlesque, usually assigned to 1607. There has, of course, been some disagreement as to whether *The Knight* was written as early as 1607 (the date accepted by Sir Edmund Chambers),<sup>2</sup> but no allusion has been found in it to any play after that date while several allusions have been noted to plays immediately preceding 1607. I strongly suspect that Humphrey's "twenty . . . & twenty more, And 20 more good-nights" was suggested to Beaumont by a parting in Middleton's *The Family of Love* (which I have elsewhere given reason for thinking was composed not long after the summer of 1605),<sup>3</sup> although it seems amusingly ironical that Middleton, whose own interests at the time were almost wholly satirical, should, in the slight portions of his plays which present romantic themes, have furnished Beaumont material for satirizing the extravagancies of the romantic drama of the day.

At the close of Act III of *The Family of Love* Maria takes leave of Gerardine with

Then twenty time adieu

I hasten to add that my suspicion that it was this line from *The Family* which suggested Humphrey's speech is based not so much upon the use of the word *twenty*—exaggerated by Beaumont with the license of burlesque—as upon there being a more obvious parody of *The Family of Love* in Act IV of *The Knight*. In the latter play Jasper, denied access to his beloved Luce, spreads the report that he has died and arranges that he, masquerading as a corpse, be borne in a coffin to Luce's chamber. In *The Family* Gerardine, similarly denied access to Maria, secures permission, upon the announcement that he will travel abroad, to send a trunk of gifts to Maria's chamber, and, of course, secretes himself within the trunk. The scenes in which the hidden lovers discover themselves are sufficiently alike to urge that Beaumont, although he has changed the trunk to a coffin, is writing with *The Family of Love* in mind and

<sup>2</sup> E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), III, 220-221.

<sup>3</sup> "A Note on the Date of Middleton's *The Family of Love*," &c., in *Elizabethan Studies . . . in Honor of George F. Reynolds* (University of Colorado Studies, Ser. B, vol. 2, no. 4, Boulder, 1945), pp. 195-200. *The Family of Love*, its title-page bearing the date 1608, was entered on *The Stationers' Register* 12 October 1607.

is ridiculing not only the devices of romantic drama but the language in which Middleton had written. In *The Family*, II, IV, the discovery is in part as follows:

*Gerardine rising out of the Trunke, she [Maria] seemes fearefull, and flies.*

*Mar* O, help, help, help!

*Ger.* Stay, sweet Maria! I bring thee ample joy  
To check that sudden fear . . . (ll. 239-41)  
Fear not, sweet wench: I am no apparition,  
But the firm substance of thy truest friend:  
Know'st thou me now?

*Mar* Gerardine, my love?

[O] what unheard-of accident presents  
Thy unexpected self . . . (ll. 244-49)

In *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* Jasper rises from the coffin as Luce lifts the cloth covering him. Then,

*Luce.* Save me, Heaven!

*Jasp* Nay, do not flie me, faire; I am no spirit:  
Looke better on me,—do you know me yet?

*Luce.* O thou deere shadow of my friend.

*Jasp* Deere substance!

• I sweare I am no shadow: feele my hand,  
It is the same it was; I am your Jasper . . . (ll. 64-69)

*Luce* So, now I am satisfied: you are no spirit,  
But mine owne truest, truest, truest friend.  
Why doe you come thus to me? (ll. 77-79)

Not only are the situations similar, as are the reactions of the two girls, but the passages present the same ideas in the same order—the girl cries for aid; her lover bids her stay and assures her he is no spirit; after recognizing him as her "truest friend," she asks why he has come. And the manner in which Beaumont seizes upon and ridicules the expression *truest friend* seems to leave little doubt that he was thinking of the passage in *The Family of Love*.

The similarity of the two passages is further emphasized when they are compared to those in other plays which make use of the device of the coffin. This device is, of course, frightfully common. Middleton was to use it in both *The Chaste Maid of Cheapside* and *The Puritan*—if that play be his; but the situation in neither of those plays at all resembles the situation as presented in *The Family* and *The Knight*. Nor has the situation in the latter plays any similarity to that of either of the two plays which have

been suggested as the possible inspiration of Beaumont's parody. Professor Alden observed that "This coffin scene [in *The Knight*] may have been suggested by that in Marston's *Antonio and Mellida* (v, 1). If *The Woman's Prize* was written as early as seems probable, Fletcher had already used a similar device there (v, 1v)."<sup>4</sup> Although Beaumont may well have intended his coffin scene as ridicule of all plays in which the device had been used, examination of the plays known to me indicates that the scene in *The Family of Love* is the only one actually parodied. The similarity to the others ends with the rising of the corpse.

In *Antonio and Mellida* the coffin is brought on to a stage filled with all the principals—eight or more. When Piero declares that he would give him Mellida "but to redeem one minute of his breath," Antonio, rising from the coffin, tells them to "Stand not amazed," and declares that he will live happy beyond comprehension if Piero keep his word; if not, he will here die. Mellida in seven lines (the last in Latin) asks if words can paint her great delight, and answers,

O no, concert, breath, passion, words, be dumbe,  
Whilst I instill the deawe of my sweete blisse  
In the soft pressure of a melting kisse.

After her one speech Mellida is silent and the conversation is carried on by others. Aside from the lover's rising from a coffin in which he had been brought in as though dead, and his receiving a kiss, the scene in *Antonio and Mellida* bears not the slightest similarity to the coffin scene in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*.

The coffin scene in *The Woman's Prize* bears even less similarity. There, as a last resort to weaken the resolution of his wife, Petruchio feigns death, and, after his coffin has been brought in, Maria, his wife, enters the stage on which there are at least six others. She appears to weep, but immediately explains that her tears are not for her dead husband but for "His poor, unmanly, wretched, foolish life." Whereupon Petruchio, angry but defeated, rises from his coffin and Maria promises that, now she has tamed him, she will never try him more.

Only in *The Family of Love* and in *The Knight* is the lover conveyed to his mistress's chamber and there rises before her while

<sup>4</sup> Raymond M. Alden, ed., *The Knight of the Burning Pestle and A King and No King* (Belles Lettres Series. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1910), p. 147.

she is alone, only in them does the girl, frightened, start to flee and is she restrained by assurances that the lover is no apparition but firm substance; and only in them is there any verbal similarity.

But Beaumont's intention, as has been said, was probably not so much the parody of Middleton's comedy as it was the ridicule of the hackneyed device of having one who had been reported dead rise from the coffin in which he had been brought on stage. The use of *The Family*—if it be admitted—is interesting, however, as another illustration of the timeliness of Beaumont's satire and of the way in which he gathered and used the materials from which he constructed his burlesque. It may, too, as a debt to still another play of the period 1605-1607, offer an additional—if slight—argument for assigning *The Knight* to 1607.

BALDWIN MAXWELL

*The University of Iowa*

---

## ROBERT BROWNING AND *A BLOT IN THE 'SCUTCHEON*

The truth concerning Browning's *A Blot in the 'Scutcheon* has suffered considerably since the first performance of the tragedy in 1843. Professor Lounsbury has convincingly shown that erroneous statements about its early history have been made both by Browning and by others.<sup>1</sup> For the sake of accuracy a further misrepresentation, heretofore unnoticed, should be corrected. It has to do with Charles Dickens' opinion of the play.

When Browning wrote *A Blot in the 'Scutcheon*, probably in the fall of 1840, he sent the manuscript to the actor William Charles Macready, who evidently did not examine it for a number of months. Under the date of September 26, 1841, Macready recorded in his *Diaries* that Forster persuaded him to read the play after dinner. It must have failed to inspire confidence in him for he did not consent to a performance at that time. Then the manuscript was sent to Dickens for his opinion. He waited a year before commenting on the play, but his reaction was quite different from Macready's. In a letter to Forster dated November 25, 1842, he wrote:

<sup>1</sup> Thomas R. Lounsbury, *The Early Literary Career of Robert Browning* (New York, 1911), pp. 112-146.

Browning's play has thrown me into a perfect passion of sorrow. To say that there is anything in its subject save what is lovely, true, deeply affecting, full of the best emotion, the most earnest feeling, and the most true and tender source of interest, is to say that there is no light in the sun, and no heat in blood. It is full of genius, natural and great thoughts, profound and yet simple and beautiful in its vigour. I know nothing that is so affecting, nothing in any book I have ever read, as Mildred's recurrence to that "I was so young—I had no mother." I know no love like it, no passion like it, no moulding of a splendid thing after its conception, like it. And I swear it is a tragedy that must be played; and must be played, moreover, by Macready. . . . And if you tell Browning that I have seen it, tell him that I believe from my soul there is no man living (and not many dead) who could produce such a work.<sup>2</sup>

In a situation which at that time was beset with prejudices, misunderstandings, and a clash of strong wills Forster evidently denied Browning the satisfaction of this letter, for Browning wrote to the editor of the *Daily News* on December 15, 1884, the following:

. . . and the glowing letter which contains his [Dickens'] opinion of it [*A Blot*], although directed by him to be shown to myself, was never heard of or seen by me till printed in Forster's book some thirty years after.<sup>3</sup>

Certainly no one can deny the dishonesty of withholding the letter from Browning, and it is hardly surprising that biographers have condemned Forster for such an act. However, the situation is somewhat misrepresented. Browning assumed that the public had no knowledge of Dickens' opinion of the play. Mrs. Orr, who likely knew firsthand how Browning felt about the matter, has left record of that assumption:

He also felt it a just cause of bitterness that the letter from Charles Dickens, which conveyed his almost passionate admiration of *A Blot in the Scutcheon*, and was clearly written to Mr Forster in order that it might be seen, was withheld for thirty years from his knowledge, and that of the public whose judgement it might so largely have influenced.<sup>4</sup>

A similar comment is made in *Literary Anecdotes of the Nineteenth Century*:

. . . he [Forster] kept its contents to himself—and some thirty years were to elapse ere the poet knew how deeply his work had touched the great novelist. The letter was made public for the first time in Forster's *Life of*

<sup>2</sup> John Forster, *The Life of Charles Dickens* (New York, 1876), I, 331-332.

<sup>3</sup> Mrs. Sutherland Orr, *Life and Letters of Robert Browning* (Boston, 1908), p. 111

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 118.



*Dickens*; and Mr. Browning made no secret of his regret that the nature of its contents had been so long withheld naturally feeling that such an expression of opinion from one so prominently before the public would have been invaluable to himself and his work at that period of his career.<sup>5</sup>

These accounts show quite clearly Browning's further assumption that had the public known of this opinion it might have been influenced because of the prominence of Dickens.

The truth is that the public did know of Dickens' opinion. Two prominent magazines of the time, one English and one American, refer to Dickens' criticism of the play, and the criticism is quite consistent with that expressed in the letter. A reviewer of Browning's works wrote in *Sharpe's London Magazine* of November, 1848:

... Charles Dickens is known to consider and declare this poet's "Blot on the Scutcheon" the most poetic, pathetic, and generally beautiful of domestic tragedies.

In a review of Browning's first American edition of poems in the December, 1849, issue of *Graham's Magazine* the critic made the following statement:

... the grandest pieces in the volume are "Pippa Passes," and "A Blot in the 'Scutcheon.'" The latter, in the opinion of Dickens, is the finest poem of the century.

Then the reviewer immediately made comments on the play that resemble more than a little the sentiment expressed by Dickens in his letter:

We think there can be detected in it that hardness of touch which characterizes the other dramas, but the depth and pathos of the matter, and the approach to something like impassioned action in the events, make it wonderfully impressive. Once read it must haunt the imagination forever, for its power strikes deep into the very substance and core of the soul. Thorold's adamant pride, and Guendolen's sweet woman's sympathy, and Mildred's awful sorrow, can never be forgotten. Mildred's repetition, in moments of agony or half-consciousness, of the lines—"I was so young—I loved him so—I had no mother—God forgot me—and I fell—" exceeds in pathetic effect anything in English dramatic literature since the Elizabethan era.

Besides the references in the reviews there is also the following comment on Dickens' opinion of *A Blot* in a book by Thomas Powell published in 1849:

<sup>5</sup> Ed. W. Robertson Nicoll and Thomas J. Wise (London, 1895), I, 433.

We have heard him [Dickens] declare that he would rather have written the "Blot in the 'Scutcheon'" than any work of modern times.<sup>6</sup>

We can safely conclude that from sometime before November, 1848, the date of the first review quoted here, the public possessed essentially the same information as that which Forster was condemned for concealing from both Browning and the public until 1873, when Forster's biography of Dickens first appeared. Then doubtless the public had the benefit of Dickens' opinion at least twenty-five of the thirty years that Browning assumed it was unknown.

It is understandable that Browning might not have had occasion to hear of the published comments in 1848 and 1849, when he and his wife were somewhat isolated in Italy. But it does seem strange that he did not learn of Dickens' opinion in the twenty-five years to elapse before the publication of Forster's biography. We can feel sure that Browning did not deliberately misrepresent the situation, for without a doubt he was an honest man. On the whole he bore adverse criticism well; he did, however, have a sensitive streak concerning his plays, especially *A Blot in the 'Scutcheon'*. He, as well as many of his supporters, felt that this play's lack of stage success was unjustified, and in their defense of it they have left the facts in a quagmire of confusion from which the truth is sometimes difficult to extricate. It is impossible to tell whether or not the statement that the public did not know of Dickens' opinion was the result of a blind defense of the play, but in any case the misrepresentation should be corrected.

GERTRUDE REESE

*The University of Texas*

---

ANC FR. *cha[i]ele[s]*, *cheles*, *chieles*, *qu[i]eles*  
'S'IL VOUS PLAÎT'

Comme étymon de cette interjection, le FEW s. v. *cavillae* 'rallierie' admet encore la théorie de A. Schulze, qui date de 1884:

Dass afrz. *chaeles* auf *cavillas* zurückgeht, hat Schulze Z 8, 299 wahrscheinlich gemacht. In Verbindungen wie *dites moi chaeles* (Erec), dann *parlés a moi*, *chaeles* konnte die ursprüngliche bed. 'kleine neckereien, unwichtige dinge' allmählich verblassen und das wort zur blossen inter-

<sup>6</sup> *The Living Authors of England* (New York, 1849), p. 175.

jektion werden. Der vokal der endung (e) eiklart sich durch attraktion von seiten des haufigen *-ie*. Der schwund des *-v-*, der sonst nur in der nahe von labialen vokalen eintritt, ist wohl durch die formelhaftigkeit und daherige schwache des wortes gefordert worden.

Meyer-Lubke, au contraire, n'a pas accepté l'étymon *cavillae* dans son REW (3<sup>e</sup> éd., s. v. *velle*), il déclare expressément fausse l'explication, par Schulze, des formes italiennes du type *covelle* 'maieseries' par *cavillae*, mais il ne mentionne pas l'a.fr. *chaeles*; s. v. *catellus*, il rejette l'explication de cette interjection par Sainéan: *chael* (< *catellus*) 'petit chien,' mais il ne l'explique pas lui-même. Dans la première édition, Meyer-Lubke avait plus ouvertement rejeté l'équation *chaeles*—*cavillae*. Je crois que Meyer-Lubke avait été bien inspiré dans son premier refus catégorique. L'hypothèse de Schulze ne peut plus, à mon avis, être défendue: à part les difficultés phonétiques, le point de départ est entièrement construit. *Dites moi chaeles* n'est que le texte abrégé du v. 1200 d'*Erec*, qui, dans l'original, est: '*Dites moi, fet ele, chaeles, [Saves vos quant Erec vandra?]*'—il n'y a donc pas de \*dire *chaeles* 'dire des maieseries' dans le texte (avec *chaeles* régime dépendant de *dites*), mais *chaeles* est une interjection indépendante (= 's'il vous plaît' ou = lat. *sodes*, qui sert à l'expliquer dans des gloses), tout à fait comme dans le texte parallèle *Vivien mès, parlés a moi, chaeles*: une interjection s'ajoutant à l'impératif '*dites-moi*,' et cet emploi est en somme l'usage général en anc.fr., que Tobler-Lommatzsch définissent très bien par "Interjektion der Aufforderung, seltener der Beteuerung, des Erstaunens, der Klage." Ce que je reproche particulièrement à l'hypothèse de Schulze, c'est la construction *ad hoc* d'une nuance de style, qui n'est pas du tout dans les textes: nulle part il n'y a la moindre indication que l'interjection "diminue" par modestie l'emphase, de sorte que ce terme serait l'équivalent de 'un peu' ('dites-moi un peu'): au contraire, cette interjection semble ajouter à la phrase la nuance de la prière pressante (cf. la note solennelle de textes comme [Tobler-Lomm.]: *Mahomet, sire, quar m'en venchiez, chaele* = 'vengez-moi un peu'?—ou *sire Renier, chaeelles, / Por Deu voz proi, le gloriouz celestre, / Ceste parole ne soit ja descouverte*).

Je crois que parmi les différentes explications données, c'est la première en date qui est à retenir: celle de Foerster dans *Zeitschrift fur die osterr. Gymnasien* 1874, 145, que l'auteur lui-même avait avancée d'une façon trop dubitative ("Sollte es nicht mit *chaeler*

'befehligen' zusammenhangen?")—procédé prudent qui a empêché les savants dans la suite de prendre sa suggestion au sérieux,<sup>1</sup> mais qui s'impose comme vérité à l'étymologiste qui a expliqué la particule a.fr. *mon* par une forme verbale pétrifiée (lat. *monéo*, cf. PMLA LXI, 607). L'impératif ou l'indicatif (au sens interrogatif) pétrifié du verbe a.fr. *cha[d]eler* 'commander, gouverner, conduire': 'commande!' ou 'commandes-tu?'. Il ne faut pas oublier que nous sommes, avec les textes anciens français, dans l'atmosphère féodale qui faisait dire couramment (cf. *Aufsätze zur rom. Syntax u. Stilistik*, p. 133) *faites moi escouter* pour 'écoutez-moi' (cf. de même en a.esp.: *mandedes lo tomar* = 'tomadle'), reflet de formules ecclésiastiques comme *jube me benedicere* 'bénis-moi': se présenter, à l'intérieur d'une hiérarchie, comme 'serviteur' obéissant à des 'ordres' appartenait au code de politesse<sup>2</sup> de cette époque, et d'établir cette fiction était particulièrement nécessaire quand on devait demander un service:<sup>3</sup> au lieu de prier le 'suzerain du

<sup>1</sup> Suchier donne le branle en opposant à l'opinion de Foerster la sienne, sans offrir d'arguments, et M. Espe, dans sa dissertation sur les interjections a fr., clôt la file en qualifiant l'idée de Foerster d'inacceptable. Breuer met un point d'interrogation dans son *Worterbuch* de Chrétien, à la place réservée pour l'étymologie, il n'a donc pas non plus retenu l'explication de son maître—Il est clair que l'accouplement de *chaele[s]* avec les formes italiennes *covelle* (signifiant tout autre chose) a embrouillé la question étymologique. *Chaele[s]* n'est que français il faut donc l'expliquer *par du français*.

Le fait que *cavillae* ait pénétré dans les langues celtiques et germaniques (FEW), ne prouve rien pour notre interjection le sens des mots d'emprunt en question est différent ('coupable, blâmable,' 'calomnier' en celtique; 'quereller' en germanique. angl. *cavil*, flam. *kabillen*; j'ajoute ici l'all argotique (Rotwelsch) *Kafiller Kaviller* 'bourreau, écorcheur,' attesté depuis 1510, que L. Gunther, *Die deutsche Gaunersprache*, p. 149, ne réussit pas à expliquer plausiblement. les sens que *cavillae* a dans les patois français, p ex. 'tromperie,' 'tricheur,' 'chicane, querelle,' nous autorisent à supposer un transfert 'chicaneur' > 'écorcheur, bourreau').

<sup>2</sup> Cf. le texte de *L'Escoufle*: "Ele a dit molt cortoisement / As meschines et as puceles / Ki devant li gisent: *Chaeles!* / Beles, car vos levez hui mais."

<sup>3</sup> La confusion la plus bizarre entre la fiction de servir un supérieur et la sollicitation réelle d'un service de sa part se trouve dans la langue de la chancellerie espagnole des Habsbourg qui emploie *ser servido* au sens de 'daigner faire qch.' (Il y a un reflet de cet usage dans le *Don Quixote*: *que vuestra merced sea servido de mostrarnos*.) À l'origine cette expression se trouvait dans des phrases comme ¡*Dios sea servido!* 'que la volonté de Dieu soit faite!' (on 'sert' Dieu en s'humiliant devant lui et en ac-

moment,' on lui demandait des ordres. On sait que dans beaucoup de langues la formule de politesse 'je vous prie' est remplacée par 'ordonnez,' p.ex. hongrois *parancsoljon leulni* 'asseyez-vous, s.v.p.,' litt. 'ordonnez de vous asseoir'; turc *buyurun*[uz] 'ordonne[z]' > 's'il vous plaît'; néo-grec *oriste*, russe *izvol'te*, *pozalui-sia*; tandis que le garçon de restaurant allemand qui veut prendre note de la commande du client emploie la formule *bitte schon?*, son confrère italien dira: *comandi?* L'emploi de *coment chieles*, litt. *coment? chaeles!* (le dictionnaire de Tobler-Lommatzsch imprime en effet ainsi dans un des textes non-bibliques: 'Li mulez dist: Coment? Chaeles! / Ore ai oi dures noveles'), dans des traductions de la bible où l'original latin a *numquid* [= 'comment donc?'], s'expliquera à partir de la nuance de la surprise, mentionnée plus haut dans ce cas, l'addition d'un 'je vous prie' est indiqué (fr.mod. *comment, je vous prie, expliquez-vous cet état de choses?*); cf. aussi les exclamations populaires que presque toutes les langues font suivre au pronom interrogatif direct. hongr. *mi csoda?* 'quoi?' (litt. 'quoi, miracle!'), all. *was zum Teufel*, angl. *what the hell*, fr. *que diantre*, logudor. *iteu* = *quid deus* etc. En tout cas, le verbe *chaeler* nous donne la nuance solennelle que je postulais tantôt pour l'interjection *chaele*[s].

On sait que le verbe *chadeler*, qui vient de *cha*[d]eɫ < *capitellum* 'tête' ('être à la tête de' > 'gouverner, commander') était en usage du XI<sup>e</sup> jusqu'au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle et que la forme avec la dentale ammuie *c*[h]aeler, aussi *caeler*, est du XII<sup>e</sup> et XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle (FEW, s. v. *capitellum*). Or, notre interjection se trouve dans les textes à partir du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle (elle n'est pas dans le ms. d'Oxford de la *Ch. de Rol.*, où se trouve la forme avec -d- de *cha*[d]eler au sens de 'gouverner': 'Cil est morz qui tuz jurs nus cadelet'),<sup>4</sup> il n'y a donc aucune difficulté chronologique. Il serait

ceptant toutes ses décisions), ainsi une phrase comme *como Dios es servido* peut évoluer vers le sens 'comme il plaît à Dieu,' et, finalement, on obtient *Dios sea servido* 'plût à Dieu'; comme en espagnol les expressions servant au culte de Dieu s'appliquent volontiers, par métaphore, au roi, son image (*majestad*; *vos* au lieu de *vosotros*, *aquí de Dios*—*aquí del rey*), on dira du roi (et de toute autorité) *que vuestro .verced sea servido de . . .*—L'all *geruhen*, 'daigner,' dit aussi de Dieu et du prince, verbe signifiant à l'origine 'prendre soin,' est attiré, au temps de Luther, dans l'orbite du verbe d'origine toute différente *ruhen* 'reposer' (Kluge-Gotze): ainsi Dieu et le prince apparaissaient comme des êtres tout-puissants, agissant sans agir.

<sup>4</sup> Dans la première édition du REW, Meyer-Lübke s. v. *capitellum*, con-

plus avantageux pour mon hypothèse si la forme avec *-d-* était attestée aussi pour l'interjection, mais on peut penser que *chaele*<sup>1</sup> ou *chaeles*<sup>2</sup> pénétrèrent dans la langue littéraire, quoique à une époque plus récente, pourtant à l'état pétrifié, où l'identité avec *cha[d]eler* n'était plus sentie. Nous pourrions aussi expliquer ainsi le prov. *caela*, que Schultz-Gora a signalé dans un manuscrit du *Givard de Roussillon*, transposition en provençal de l'anc fr. *chaele*, alors que le verbe pour 'gouverner' se trouve dans ce même texte sous la forme *chadeler*. Le *ç* de *chaeles* concorde avec le *ç* des formes accentuées sur le radical de *chaeler* et avec le *ẽ* de l'étymon: \**capitellat*. De *cha[i]eles* on obtient ensuite des formes abrégées comme *chieles*, *cheles* etc.

LEO SPITZER

#### A SOURCE OF DON RAMÓN DE LA CRUZ

The presentation of Houdart de la Motte's tragedy *Inès de Castro* on April 6, 1723 aroused a storm of criticism comparable to that of the *Cid*.<sup>1</sup> Houdart had undertaken to dramatize once again the tragic and moving story of the famous Portuguese heroine of the fourteenth century, the beloved of Dom Pedro and mother of his three children, who had become enmeshed in political rivalries and hatreds and was murdered by some counsellors of the realm over the King's initial objections. However, the author had taken a poet's liberties with the story by arbitrarily introducing a new element, wholly absent from both history and legend. He created the role of Pedro's stepmother, the Queen, mother both to Pedro's betrothed Constance, and to Ferdinand, King of Castile. This woman, fiercely devoted to her daughter's happiness, poisons the latter's rival who dies after her marriage to the heir to the throne has been sanctioned by the King. In addition to this disregard of

sidérât l'a.fr. *chadeler* comme emprunt au prov. *capdelar*; dans la troisième édition il a omis le mot a.fr. Il nous faut probablement arriver à la conclusion que *chadeler* est un reflet autochtone en ancien français (cf. *malehâbitus* > *malade*), continué par la forme sans *d*: on remarque la même chute du *-d-* dans le nom a.fr. *chadel* 'chef' (<*capitellum*) > *chael*

<sup>1</sup> Arsène Houssaye, *Men and Women of the Eighteenth Century*, Part II, London, G. W. Dillingham, 1886, pp. 64-68; also V. B. Grannis, *Dramatic Parody in the 18th Century*, N. Y., Publications of the Institute of French Studies, 1931.

fact, Houdart was accused of having violated canons of good taste: violence was rampant on the stage, the play often descended to the level of bathos, he had had the audacity to introduce children on the stage, and had even appropriated a line from Corneille.

The culmination of the attacks on the notwithstandingly successful author came with the presentation of a one-act satire on July 24th of the same year. the *Agnès de Chaillot* of Legrand and Dominique,<sup>2</sup> the very title of which is a derisive pun on the name of the heroine. Almost half a century later, in 1770, this satire was the model which Don Ramón de la Cruz used for writing his "sainete trágico," *Inesilla la de Pinto*.<sup>3</sup> This little work of the Spanish humorist follows the action of the French playlet faithfully, even to the boisterous humor, the piquant sallies, the puns, the gauloiserie.<sup>4</sup> Both works reduce the heroic attitudes of the original treatment to sheer ridicule: mockery is made of all high-flown sentiments, and the noble characters are metamorphosed into coarse bourgeois acting against the background of the kitchen. Lofty phrases mix with low comedy, salacious undertones and solid rustic speech.

In the French travesty the King had become Trivelin, the "bailli" who is at the same time a baker, and in the hands of de la Cruz he assumes the figure of Espejo, the "alcalde." The Queen descends the same two steps toward burlesque: in French she had been the virago "baillive" and in Spanish she is the fierce "alcaldesa" who warns the poor kitchen-maid, Inesilla, that if she finds the woman who is turning her son's head (the "alcaldesa" is no longer a stepmother), she will make a "potaje" of her (107).

If the original Pedro had gallantly conquered the Moors, and his mock counterpart Pierrot had won a prize for prowess with the "arquebuse," Chinica the hero of *Inesilla* returns victorious from having beheaded a rooster! Pierrot had overcome all resistance on

<sup>2</sup> All references made to this play will be from the text *Agnès de Chaillot*, in *Fin du Répertoire du Théâtre Français*, Vol 5, Paris, chez Mme Dabo-Butchart, 1826, pp 93-128.

<sup>3</sup> *Inesilla la de Pinto*, pp 105-111, *Sainetes de Don Ramón de la Cruz*, Don Emilio Cotarela y Mori, *Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, Madrid, Casa Editorial Bailly-Baillière, 1928.

<sup>4</sup> In his *Don Ramón de la Cruz y sus Obras*, Madrid, Imprenta de José Perales y Martínez, 1899, p 351, Cotarelo y Mori notes that the *Inesilla* is a parody of the tragedy of *Inés de Castro*, referring to no special work and adding that " . . . pudo tener presente la *Agnès de Chaillot*."

the part of the virtuous Agnès by seizing a kitchen knife in a wily move to commit a frustrated lover's suicide. Chinica was equally clever, one day he had found Inesilla cleaning eggplants and had made his advances, only to be rebuffed. Whereupon he too had seized the large kitchen knife and had been on the point of killing himself. The tender Inesilla, in her own words too sensitive even to kill a flea, had snatched the knife from him, and since then they were one.

The young hero refuses to marry his father's choice, the daughter of the mayor of another village. Like Trivelin before him, and the King before Trivelin, Espejo is afraid of war with the neighboring "power." And if the rash Pedro had been willing to fight all of Castile to retain his Inès, and Pierrot all of Gonesse for Agnès, Chinica will fight the entire town of Villecas en Pinto, and will even protect Inesilla against a squadron of mothers-in-law!

Following the fate of Inès and Agnès at the hands of the Queen and Baillive respectively, Inesilla is exposed by the *alcaldesa* and is handed over to her custody, to be imprisoned in the kitchen! The *alcalde* calls a meeting of the council of "*aguaciles*." Now one of the strictures aimed at Houdart was that in the scene of the meeting of his advisors, four *grandees* had come on the stage, although two were superfluous as they said nothing and contributed nothing to the action. Legrand and Dominique had satirized this element of the tragedy by introducing as "*grands*" the very commonplace "*Marguillier d'honneur*," the "*Carillonneur*," Arlequin the "*Bedeau*," and the "*Magister*." Of these only two count: first, Arlequin who, like Rodrigue of the Houdart drama, is in love with Agnès and yet advises leniency, and the "*Magister*." The latter, although he had been saved by Pierrot from being run over by a cart while sleeping in a drunken stupor in the public square, urges that a father must uphold his authority. Ramón de la Cruz reverses the order. In his version, Simón the schoolmaster advises severe punishment while Callejo the "*regidor*" defends Chinica because once when he had been stretched out at the door of the City Hall, Chinica had carried him home on his shoulders.

At this point Inesilla follows the example of her forerunners by ushering in her four children (the number of Inès' children had been three; the brood was increased by one in both the French and Spanish parodies) in an attempt to mollify the *alcalde*. King Alphonse had been moved by the appearance of his hitherto un-



known grandchildren, but the Bailli had reacted in typical "villain" fashion and the words of the Alcalde are almost a literal translation from the French.

*Bailli* (120): Et d'où diable a-t-on fait sortir ces marmots-là:  
 Ai-je dans ma maison des chambres inconnues?  
 Oh! pour le coup, il faut qu'ils soient tombés des nues.  
 Ont-ils pu parvenir à l'âge où les voilà  
 Sans qu'aucun du logis ait rien su de cela?

*Espejo* (110) ¿De dónde ha salido esta  
 tropa de zánganos? ¿Hay  
 alguna encantada cueva  
 en esta casa? O ¿qué nube  
 los ha arrojado a mis puertas?

And the ribaldry of Inesilla's answer to her father-in-law's questions is simply the French words all over again.

*Inesilla* (110) No miréis mi rostro, ved  
 el vuestro, y si por las señas  
 queréis conocer su origen,  
 ellos ignoran quién sea  
 su padre, como muchos otros.

*Agnes* (121) N'y voyez point mes traits, n'y voyez que les vôtres  
 Ils ignorent leur père ainsi que beaucoup d'autres.

*Espejo* Y el traerme los chiquillos,  
 ¿te parece a ti que es prueba  
 para mí de estar casada?  
 ¿No era mala impertinencia!

*Bailli*: Pour prouver un hymen, petite impertinente,  
 Vous montrez des enfans! La preuve en est plaisante!

Like the Bailli, however, Espejo is finally won over. At this turn of events, Agnès, poisoned by the Baillive, had complained of "la colique." Since the alcaldesa in this play has no personal motive for vengeance, Inesilla can only say that

. . . no hallo más  
 arbitrio que caerme muerta.

In the meanwhile, Chinica, to save Inesilla and to follow the pattern of his literary forbears, has revolted and rushes in only to find her in a faint or perhaps dying. He wishes to follow her in death. Pedro, too, had wished to kill himself but had been stopped by Inès' dying injunction to live as a consolation to his father. Pierrot had

wished to kill himself but had changed his mind since a happy ending would make for better box-office receipts, to which treatment the moribund Agnès had readily responded. Inesilla cannot fall behind either: someone has some "rosoli" which will revive her. In a burst of energy, Espejo offers her the entire bottle!

MARTIN NOZICK

*Oberlin College*

---

### GRIMM'S ALLEGED AUTHORSHIP OF CERTAIN ARTICLES ON THE THEATER IN PARIS

It has been the claim of some scholars,<sup>1</sup> who apparently did not consult the texts involved, that Melchior Grimm is the author of the articles on the theater in Paris which appeared in the *Beytrage zur Historie und Aufnahme des Theaters*. This review, which appeared for four issues in Stuttgart in 1750, was edited by Mylius and Lessing, and was devoted to translations and news of foreign theaters.<sup>2</sup> The editors insisted, in a footnote to the first article, that the views expressed came directly from Paris itself.<sup>3</sup> On the basis of chronology, Grimm might have been the author of the articles in question, for the ambitious young German had only recently arrived in the French capital,<sup>4</sup> and it is certain that he possessed a lively interest in all things connected with the theater.

Although the first division of the first article bears the date of September 10, 1749, the majority of the items containing news of the Parisian stage referred to events which had occurred before that date. For example, reference was made to the presentation of Crébillon's *Catilina* and of Voltaire's *Sémiramis*. The former was played on December 20, 1748 and the latter on August 29 of the same year. The *Beytrage* critic included a translation of a letter from Voltaire to the Queen concerning a parody of his play and,

<sup>1</sup> Th. W. Danzel, *Gottsched und seine Zeit*, 2. ed., Leipzig, 1855, p. 177; and André Cazes, *Grimm et les Encyclopédistes*, Paris, 1933, p. 57

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Edmond Schérer, *Melchior Grimm* . . . , Paris, 1880, p. 395

<sup>3</sup> *Erster Band*, p. 110. "Wir haben diese Nachrichten von guter Hand. Die darinne gefallte Urtheile kommen nicht von uns, sondern selbst aus Paris."

<sup>4</sup> He arrived early in February, 1749. Cf. *Correspondance littéraire*, xvi, 289.

although this letter was described as "etwas geheimes," it was actually written in January or February of 1749,<sup>5</sup> and hence had been in circulation for eight or nine months.

The second part of this first article in the *Beyträge* was dated October 2, 1749 and contained more recent news. It recorded the performance of Mme du Bocage's play *Les Amazones*, which took place July 24, 1749, and stated that the play was presented for nine consecutive times.<sup>6</sup> These facts are confirmed by the Abbé Raynal,<sup>7</sup> whom Grimm succeeded as literary correspondent, as is the news of the printing of the parody of *Sémiramis* and a detailed analysis of its characters. The author of the article then proceeded to make a plea to the public for tolerance toward new plays on the grounds that masterpieces sometimes follow poor first attempts. He cited the case of Corneille, whose first plays did not measure up to his later tragedies, which are ". . . noch itzt die Ehre und die festeste Stütze unsres Theaters"<sup>8</sup>

Upon comparing these views with judgments later expressed by Grimm in his *Correspondance littéraire*, it appears doubtful that he was the author of this article in the *Beyträge*. It is indeed unlikely that he, an enthusiastic and consistent admirer of the ancients, would have recorded without qualification the opinion that any modern was worth all the ancients.<sup>9</sup> In the article, *Sémiramis* was called a bad play which deserved no more success than it received.<sup>10</sup> But when it was later presented again in August, 1756, Grimm ranked it ". . . parmi les plus beaux ouvrages de ce génie supérieur."<sup>11</sup> The German critic knew the works of Voltaire before he came to France—indeed he once planned to publish in

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Raynal, *Nouvelles littéraires*, I, 263 (included in Tourneux' edition of Grimm's *Correspondance littéraire*).

<sup>6</sup> *Erster Band*, p. 117.

<sup>7</sup> Raynal, *op cit*, I, 344. I am grateful to Professor H. C. Lancaster for checking the *Registres* of the Comédie-Française, which show that *Les Amazones* was actually presented eleven times, having been played again on August 11 and August 13, after Raynal's report written on August 10.

<sup>8</sup> *Erster Band*, p. 118.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 119. "Die Trauerspiele, le Cid, les Horaces, Cinna, Pompée, Rodogune, Poëucte, Héraclius, Nicomède, Sertorius, welches alles Stücke sind, die zur Unsterblichkeit erlangen werden, welche sie, nach vieler Meinung, mehr verdienen, als alle Stücke der Alten. . ."

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 113.

<sup>11</sup> Grimm, *op. cit.*, III, 277.

Germany Voltaire's *Mémoire sur la satire*<sup>12</sup>—and expressed his surprise upon hearing criticism of Voltaire at the time of his arrival.<sup>13</sup> In his first letter to the *Mercure*<sup>14</sup> he had nothing but praise for the great master. Because of this discrepancy alone, it would seem difficult to support the claim that Grimm wrote this article for the *Beytrage*, and another factor which makes authorship doubtful is the praise of French actors to be found in the German periodical.<sup>15</sup> The writer maintained that many plays owed their success to the acting and that Parisian actors were constantly striving to improve their art. This is diametrically opposed to the opinion of Grimm in 1753 when he reviewed the first play for his *Correspondance littéraire*.<sup>16</sup>

The first part of the second article in the *Beytrage* was dated November 1, 1749 and was devoted largely to an account of Voltaire's *Nanine*. The play was first presented June 16, 1749 and had little success.<sup>17</sup> As in the first article, then, the news from Paris was far from being the latest. The author's principal objections to Voltaire's comedy were first, that the name had no significance and second, that it came nearer being a tragedy than a comedy. The second part of the article reported the first performance of the opera *Zoroastre* by Rameau and Cahusac (December 5, 1748). The author limited his comments to praise of the settings and recorded merely that it was the most successful opera ever presented in Paris. In his *Lettre sur Omphale* (1752), by contrast, Grimm called this opera "sublime."<sup>18</sup>

The third article in the *Beytrage* consisted entirely of lists of actors and actresses of the Comédie-Française and of plays presented there and at the Théâtre-Italien. The last article was a translation into German of *L'Art du Théâtre* by François Riccoboni.

Thus of the four articles, only the first two contain any critical comment and in the light of the evidence presented it seems extremely unlikely that Grimm wrote them. In a letter to Gottsched written from Paris November 30, 1751, Grimm stated that he did

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Danzel, *op. cit.*, p. 345 (1747).

<sup>13</sup> Grimm, *op. cit.*, x, 63.

<sup>14</sup> *Mercure de France*, August 4, 1750.

<sup>15</sup> *Erster Band*, pp. 110-111.

<sup>16</sup> Grimm, *op. cit.*, II, 243.

<sup>17</sup> Raynal, *op. cit.*, I, 321 ff.; cf. *Beyträge*, p. 450.

<sup>18</sup> Grimm, *op. cit.*, xvi, 310.

not know the identity of the author of certain "Parisian articles."<sup>19</sup> Although there is no further identification of these articles which Grimm assured Gottsched he did not write, it is likely that he was referring to those in the *Beytrage zur Historie und Aufnahme des Theaters*. It would at least be rash to base any judgment of Grimm's early views of the French theater on these documents.

JOSEPH R. SMILEY

University of Illinois

### THE ENGLISH VERSES IN THE HULOET-HIGGINS DICTIONAIRE OF 1572

In her *Parts Added to the Mirror for Magistrates*, Professor Lily Campbell has given the best account we have of John Higgins,<sup>1</sup> but she has overlooked a hundred or more verses, scraps translated from Latin texts, which Higgins published in his *Dictionarie*. The *Dictionarie* (1572) is a revision of Richard Huloet's *Abececlarium anglico-latinum* (1552). Among the verses in it are several epigrams from Martial and two stanzas which Higgins later reprinted, with slight alterations, in the "tragedy" of Albanact.

It is strange that the epigrams from Martial have gone unnoticed. There had been earlier translations of single epigrams, and Huloet, in the *Abececlarium*, had printed three which he translated in 1552 at the latest, perhaps by 1545;<sup>2</sup> but when Higgins rewrote these three and made his own versions of five others and a part of a sixth,<sup>3</sup> he presented the first substantial number of Martial's epigrams to appear in English dress. The reappearance of three of Higgins' efforts<sup>4</sup> in Timothy Kendall's *Flowers* (1577) suggests that Martial's early popularity in the schools was spreading to wider circles.

<sup>19</sup> Danzel, *op. cit.*, p. 349

<sup>1</sup> Lily Campbell, editor, *Parts Added to the Mirror for Magistrates* (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1946), pp. 3-28.

<sup>2</sup> The epigrams are XIV, 202 (*s. v. Babion*); XIII, 66 (*s. v. Doue*); XIII, 14 (*s. v. Lettuce*). The date is suggested *s. v. Danell*.

<sup>3</sup> II, 7 (*s. v. Attalus*); I, 65 (*s. v. Figge*); XIII, 46 (*s. v. Peache*); XIV, 18 (*s. v. Play*); XII, 54 (*s. v. Purblynde*); IV, 54, ll 5-6 (*s. v. Ladies*). References are to W. Heraeus' Teubner text.

<sup>4</sup> II, 7; I, 65; XII, 54.

Some of Higgins' tastes other than his liking for Martial are generously indulged in his *Dictionary*, and their indulgence provides evidence that perhaps by 1571 he had already determined to make additions to the *Mirror for Magistrates*. He includes a good deal of material showing a strong interest in history, especially in the falls of states and princes; and since he is a patriot, he finds, in history, lessons of private and political virtue for his countrymen. All this is commonplace, but there are other parallels between the *Mirror* and the *Dictionary* which are less ambiguous. The description of Bath, in the *Dictionary*, is versified word for word in the tragedy of King Bladud,<sup>5</sup> and although the Elyot-Cooper dictionaries, which Higgins is often content to follow, had long ago exploded the "vulgar opinion" how Britain got its name, Higgins tells the story of Albion's Brutus at some length and takes the opportunity of translating some Latin verses which he may have found in Geoffrey of Monmouth.

And mynding to seeke some desert countie for hym and his, he [Brutus] made his peticion to *Diana* in this sorte.

*Dua potens nemorum, terror syluestribus apris,  
Cui licet anfractus ire per aethereos,  
Infernasq; domos, terrestria vira resolue:  
Et dic quas terras, nos habitare velis  
Dic certam sedem, qua te venerabor in aeuum,  
Qua tibi virgineis, templa dicabo choris.*

Whiche I haue Englished (though not so well as I woulde, yet so nere the sence as is requisite) in this maner followyng

O Goddess great in woodes, that putste  
Wylde boares in tearefull feare,  
Whiche mayste goe all the turning pathes  
Of euery ayrie sphere,  
And of infernall houses eke  
Resolue the earthly rightes,  
And shewe what countrey in to dwell  
Thou giuste me after fightes,  
Assigne a certaine seate, wher I  
Shall worship the for aye,  
And wher repleat with virgins, I  
Erect thy temples may.

To which petition, *Brutus* as he slepte receaued (by a vision) this aunswere.

*Brute sub occasu solis, trans gallica regna,  
Insula in Oceano est, vndique clausa mari,*

---

<sup>5</sup> Campbell, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

*Insula in Oceano est, habitata gigantibus olim,  
 Nunc deserta quidem gentibus apta tuis  
 Hanc pete, namq, tibi sedes erit illa perennis,  
 Hic fiet natus, altera Troia tuis  
 Hic de prole tua reges nascentur, & ipsis  
 Totius terrae, subditus orbis erit.*

Whiche may be thus Englished.

O Brute farre vnder Phebus fall,  
 Beyond of Fraunce that groundes,  
 An Iland in the Ocean is,  
 With sea t'is compast rounde,  
 An Iland in the Ocean is,  
 Where gigantes earst did dwell,  
 And now a desert place thats apte  
 Will serue thy people well,  
 To this directe thy race, for there  
 Shalbe thy seate for aye,  
 And to thy sonnes there shalbe builde,  
 An other stately Troye  
 Here of thy progeny and stocke  
 Shall mighty kinges descende,  
 And vnto them, as subiect all  
 The worlde shall bowe and bende <sup>6</sup>

This entry can be assigned, with moderate confidence, to the year 1571, for in his thirty-line history of the world (*s. v Daniel*) Higgins writes that the fourth of the "four high Monarchies" was inaugurated ".47. yeares before Christes birth" and "hath stande these .1618. yeares." Since the stanzas of Brutus' prayer and Diana's answer were in 1574 reprinted, with a few slight verbal changes, as lines 197-202 and 217-224 of the tragedy of *Albanact*,<sup>7</sup> one is less unwilling to believe some part of Higgins' suspicious story how he began the writing of his tragedies. Perhaps, as he says,<sup>8</sup> he did first write a few of them as an experiment which, at the encouragement of friends, he continued when time and leisure were given him.

In any case, the probability is established that by 1571 he was planning his additions to the *Mirror*, and may have begun to write them; and whatever the degree of probability which one allows to

<sup>6</sup> For the Latin, cf. Geoffrey, *Historia*, ed. Griscom, pp. 238-239; also Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ed. Luard, I, 19-20; and *Flores Historiarum*, ed. Luard, I, 22-23.

<sup>7</sup> Campbell, *op cit*, pp. 54-55.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 37. ,

from the normal text for that passage of the *Pharsalia*,<sup>2</sup> and the result is something which could never be turned into English.

2. The immediate source of the Latin text is Octavianus Mirandula's handy little anthology of appropriate quotations, *Illustrium Poetarum Flores*,<sup>3</sup> and not Lucan's *Pharsalia*. Under "De Bello" in Mirandula's book is to be found the quotation from Lucan which Lodge uses, beginning at line 101, as does Lodge's, and ending, as does Lodge's again, in the middle of line 109. Since the description of the horrors of war in the *Pharsalia* continues for another hundred lines, there is no particular reason why Lodge should have stopped at this point, except that Mirandula did.

3. Although Lodge is using Mirandula's text for his quotation, he is not using it for his translation. This becomes clear when we compare the fifth line of Lodge with Mirandula and with the normal Lucan text of the sixteenth century<sup>4</sup> (there are two manuscript traditions for the line at this time, typified by the 1505 and the 1506 editions):

1505 Lucan	Non senis extremum piguit vergentibus annis
Mirandula:	Non senis extremum piguit ferventibus annis
Lodge	Non senis extremum pigint ferventibus annis
1506 Lucan:	Non senis extremum piguit urgentibus annis
Lodge's	. . . These troublous times . . .
English	:

So far as I have been able to determine, the reading "ferventibus annis" occurs in only two places—in Mirandula and in Lodge. No edition of Lucan which I have seen carries it, nor does any collection of quotations.

Lodge's "ferventibus annis," which is more likely to be a corruption of the 1505 "vergentibus annis" than of the 1506 "urgentibus annis," is probably best translated "burning times";

<sup>2</sup> Some of these, e.g. "luteque" (line 1) and "pigint" (line 5) are probably the result of the printer's misreading Lodge's hand when he wrote "lateque" and "piguit" (See Samuel A. Tannenbaum, *Handwriting of the Renaissance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1930, 28, 77).

<sup>3</sup> The passage occurs in the three editions of Mirandula which I was able to examine: Antwerp, 1549; Lyons, 1579; Lyons, 1582.

<sup>4</sup> The following editions were consulted: Sulpitius, Venice, 1493; Sabellicus, Venice, 1498; Omnibonus and Sulpitius, Venice, 1505; Sulpitius, Paris, 1506; Lyons, 1547; Lyons, 1551; Antwerp, 1556; Hortensius, Basel, 1578; London, 1589; Pulmannus, Antwerp, 1592.



at any rate, his translation "troubulous times" does not fit "fer-ventibus annis." But "troubulous times" does fit the 1506 reading, "urgentibus annis."

The relation between these lines seems to be this: the Latin in Lodge stems from *Mirandula*, which in turn stems from a Lucan text like that of the 1505 edition. Lodge's English, on the other hand, seems to be a translation of a text like that of the 1506 edition. Exactly what happened we shall probably never know. Lodge either made his own translation at an earlier date and found use for it here, or else inserted some one else's translation into *Wits Miserie*. Since no translation into English of the second book of the *Pharsalia* has come down to us, it is not probable that we will ever find out if the translation is Lodge's, or if not, from whom Lodge borrowed it.

RALPH WATERBURY CONDEE

*University of Illinois*

### "THIEVES OF THE DAY'S BEAUTY"

Various editors<sup>1</sup> of *I Henry IV* have shown by their conjectures that Falstaff's mock plea to the Prince (I, ii, 25) is a crux:

Marry, then, sweet wag, when thou art king, let not us that are squires of the night's body be called thieves of the day's beauty.

The puns have been duly appreciated: "squires of the (k)night's body" and the triple play on "body"—"beauty"—*booty*. "Squire of the body" is a standard phrase. But what is the meaning of "let not us . . . be called thieves of the day's beauty"?

The scene is full of recurrences that have to be closely heeded. It seems that the remark looks forward to some grim jesting about the gallows that thieves face if they are caught. The Prince in his answer says,

Thou sayest well, and it holds well too; for the fortune of us that are the moon's men doth ebb and flow . . . now in as low an ebb as the foot of the ladder, and by-and-by in as high a flow as the ridge of the gallows

And the jests about the sheriff and the hangman continue, and

<sup>1</sup> See the *New Variorum*, ed. S. B. Hemingway (Philadelphia, 1936); Kittredge (Boston, 1940); Dover Wilson (Cambridge, 1946).

produce such ambiguity as Falstaff's "Do not thou, when thou art king, hang a thief" and the Prince's quick reply, "No; thou shalt." This last can mean not only what Falstaff takes it to mean, that he shall be a judge, and what the Prince, correcting, says he means, that Falstaff shall be a hangman, it can obviously mean "thou shalt hang *as* a thief."

In the light of such jokes about "shall there be a gallows standing when thou art king?",<sup>2</sup> it looks as if Falstaff is saying, "Let not us be called 'thieves of the day's beauty' because we have met what is at present the common fate of our profession and spoiled the beauty of the day by getting hanged along the highway—an ugly sight." The latest editor, having admitted that the line was "obscure," himself provided the necessary hint when he came to annotate Falstaff's later remark to Bardolph (iv, ii, 35): "A mad fellow met me on the way, and told me I had unloaded all the gibbets and pressed the dead bodies." Dover Wilson's note on "gibbets" reads: "Common on the highway, petty theft being a capital offense down to the nineteenth century." Indeed one can quote Autolycus: "Gallows and knock are too powerful on the highway."<sup>3</sup>

Falstaff was to learn how powerful "knock" was. But here the cream of the jest would be that he is thief turned aesthete, craving for the banishment under Hal of that public eyesore the gallows.

EDWARD S. LE COMTE

*University of California,  
Berkeley, California*

<sup>2</sup> I have kept in these quotations to the one scene, going no further than a few lines from the sentence under discussion, but this logical concern of this set of characters with the gallows can be traced through the play. Gadshill says (ii, i, 73). "What talkest thou to me of the hangman? If I hang, I'll make a fat pair of gallows; for if I hang, old Sir John hangs with me, and thou knowest he is no starveling." In ii, ii, Falstaff indulges in the "damnable iteration" of "be hanged" no less than five times, and, as if to prove that this is no empty figure of speech, he has the clause "if I scape hanging" once.

<sup>3</sup> *The Winter's Tale*, iv, ii, 28.

## SIDNEY AND CUPID'S DART

Sir Philip Sidney's editors and biographers do not seem to have noticed that neither chance nor convention dictated the figure employed in the lines from Sonnet V of *Astrophel and Stella*:

It is most true, what we call *Cupids* dart  
An image is, which for ourselves we carve. . . .<sup>1</sup>

Taken in conjunction with Sidney's coat of arms, or a *pheon azure*, these lines assume a new and precise significance.<sup>2</sup> The heraldic *pheon* is nothing more nor less than the head of a dart; and the allusion must have been instantly appreciated by Sidney's contemporaries, if not by modern readers less sensitive in matters of emblems and blazonings. What seems superficially a mere conceit now appears as an intensification of the poet's wry commentary on the tangled affairs of his own heart. Once again we are confronted with the close frame of personal reference which is such a prominent feature of the sonnets, and which has called forth so many complicated and contradictory biographical analyses of *Astrophel and Stella*.

WILLIAM H. BOND

*Houghton Library*

---

## THE DATE OF DONNE'S "THE ANNUNCIATION AND PASSION"

A persistent error has caused Donne's verses "Upon the Annunciation and Passion Falling upon One Day" to be dated 1609 in the editions of Sir Edmund Chambers, Sir Herbert Grierson, and R. E. Bennett, and in Evelyn Hardy's biography.<sup>1</sup> As Chambers'

<sup>1</sup> *Astrophel and Stella*, ed. Mona Wilson (1931), p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> The arms may be seen in many contemporary portraits of Sidney, and particularly in Thomas Lant's engravings of Sidney's funeral procession (*S. T. C.* 15224), where they appear both singly and with all the quarterings appertaining to their proprietor.

<sup>3</sup> *Poems of John Donne*, ed. E. K. Chambers, 1896, I, 246; *The Poems of John Donne*, ed. Herbert J. C. Grierson, 1912, II, 238; ed. Sir H. J. C. Grierson, 1933, p. xli; *The Complete Poems of John Donne*, ed. Roger E. Bennett, 1942, p. 255; Evelyn Hardy, *Donne*, 1942, p. 129. The verses are

and Grierson's notes reveal, the error arises from taking March 25, 1608, the manuscript date, as meaning March 25, 1608/9. But such an interpretation is wrong on the face of it, since dual dating applies only from January 1 to March 24; March 25 was the first day of 1608, Old Style, and would be dated 1608 New Style also. That the poem was written in 1608 is substantiated by the fact that 1597 and 1608 were the only years in Donne's lifetime in which Good Friday fell on March 25, the Feast of the Annunciation.<sup>2</sup>

RHODES DUNLAP

University of Iowa

### THE LITERARY HERO IN A SENTIMENTAL AGE: AN UNLISTED REFERENCE TO MILTON

By the end of the eighteenth century Milton was firmly established as the literary hero of Americans. "No writer," says Leon Howard in his account of Milton's reputation during the colonial period, "kept a higher position throughout the entire one hundred and fifty years."<sup>1</sup> The characteristic American attitude was one of awe, neither Milton nor his masterpiece was thought to have a peer. American poets might imitate the minor poems and point with pride to even slight evidences of Milton's influence, but they cherished no hopes of achieving the sublimity of his great epic.<sup>2</sup> It is understandable, therefore, why *Paradise Lost* was the foundation of Milton's reputation in colonial America.

So popular were the poems of Milton between the years 1787 and 1815 that twenty-eight American editions were printed.<sup>3</sup> Apparently the poet's vogue in America was to continue, but it was soon to take on a new coloring. In a volume of poems by Henry Pickering entitled *The Ruins of Paestum: and other Compositions in Verse*, Salem, Mass., 1822, there is a reference interesting to

headed 1608 in John Hayward's edition of the *Complete Poetry and Selected Prose*, 1929, p. 290

<sup>2</sup> See calendar in *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, ed. Sir Paul Harvey, Second Edition, pp. 899-900

<sup>1</sup> Leon Howard, "Early American Copies of Milton," *Huntington Library Bulletin*, VII, 179 (Apr., 1935).

<sup>2</sup> Leon Howard, "The Influence of Milton on Colonial American Poetry," *Huntington Library Bulletin*, IX, 70 (Apr., 1936)

<sup>3</sup> "Early American Copies of Milton," p. 179.

Milton bibliographers<sup>4</sup> as well as to students of American sentimentalism. By his treatment of Milton Pickering reveals that he liked to view the poet as a man of sentiment, and for that reason he fully exploited the sentimental fable of Milton and the Italian maiden.

This fable is presumed to date from 1819 when it first appeared in the Italian journal *Il Raccoglitore*,<sup>5</sup> the American poet, since he visited Italy before 1822, may have come upon the fable there. Pickering's allusion to Milton occurs in a poem<sup>6</sup> in praise of Italy, the land of inspiration for great poets:

To thee, bright land, we seek 'whatever fair  
High fancy forms, or lavish hearts can wish'  
To thee, on wings of ecstasy, the bard  
Like him of Avon flies, and in thy shades  
Drinks inspiration; or amid thy bowers,  
Like Milton, erring seeks an earthly love,  
And clasps instead, sparkling with gems of heaven,  
A sky-born maid!

Fortunately a note was appended to these tortured lines:

An Italian lady travelling near Cambridge while Milton was at the university, happened to discover him asleep by the road side. The incident excited her curiosity, and she stopped to survey the youth. Struck with his extraordinary personal charms, she immediately wrote with her pencil a few lines from an Italian poet . . . and without disturbing his slumber, deposited them by his side. The surprise of the youth when he awoke may readily be imagined. It was in pursuit of this lady that Milton, it is said, made his journey to Italy. and this, we are to believe, was the origin of the immortal poem of *Paradise Lost*!!

The short paragraph introducing Pickering's note clearly revealed his frame of mind:

The beautiful story concerning Milton, to which allusion is made in the above lines, may not be recalled by everyone. It is probably apocryphal, but is scarcely the less interesting on that account.

The Milton anecdote was first printed in England for the purpose

<sup>4</sup> Pickering's volume does not appear in either H. F. Fletcher, *Contributions to a Milton Bibliography, 1800-1930* Urbana, Ill., 1931, or D. F. Stevens, *Reference Guide to Milton from 1800 to the Present Day*, Chicago, 1930.

<sup>5</sup> Vol. VI, p. 60, the author David Bertilotti, cf. Stevens, p. 167.

<sup>6</sup> "Reflections on viewing the beautiful Moonlight Picture by the same Artist [i. e., Washington Allston]," *Ruins*, pp. 93-94, 127.

of refuting it, since the writer had discovered the same Italian maiden pencilling an identical Guarini quatrain in praise of a different person, but no sentimental story at that period could be killed by mere truth, and so for more than a decade the romantic fable was repeated or embellished by a number of English writers.<sup>7</sup>

The particular emphasis which Pickering gave his account, in contrast to the English treatment of the fable, is worth noting. Byerley's refutation quite naturally stressed the parallel stories. Henry Neele wove the episode of the Italian maiden with the Leonora material and thus explained the sonnets. The author of "Milton's Beauty" connected the fable with that popular legend. Pickering's interest, however, lay in the fable's causal relation to *Paradise Lost*. Colonial Americans had habitually identified Milton with his epic poem; after the sentimentalists had transformed Milton into the conventional slave of passion, they found new reasons for admiring the poet's masterpiece.

Public appetite for sentimental heroes probably accounts for the nature of much American prose fiction up to the Civil War, during this period our national heroes were also given sentimental interpretation.<sup>8</sup> Additional proof of the impelling force of this temper is the appearance in 1822 of Milton, America's literary hero, in the trappings of a man of sentiment.

MARGARET DENNY

*The University of Rochester*

---

<sup>7</sup> (1) Stephen Collet (pseudonym of Thomas Byerley), "Fable in Milton's Life Refuted," *Relics of Literature*, London, 1823, cf. Fletcher, p. 20 (2) Henry Neele, "The Poet's Dream," *Hommage aux Dames*, London, 1825, reprinted in *Lectures on English Poetry and other Literary Remains*, 1st ed., 1829, 2d ed., 1830, cf. Fletcher, pp. 22, 25, 29 (3) Anon. "A Milton Anecdote," *Monthly Review*, n. s. v, 599 (1827), a translation from "a foreign journal," cf. Stevens, p. 193 (4) Socius, "Milton's Beauty," *Facetiae Cantabrigienses*, 3d ed., London, 1830, cf. Fletcher, p. 29. Students of American intellectual history who are concerned with the so-called "time-lag" in the transit of literary fashions and modes of thought from overseas will observe that Pickering's 1822 volume predates allusion to the fable in English publications.

<sup>8</sup> See Herbert Ross Brown, *The Sentimental Novel in America*, Durham, N. C., 1940, and Dixon Wecter, *The Hero in America*, N. Y., 1941.

## MILTON AND RABBI ELIEZER

In 1819 Richard Laurence brought out an edition of the *Ascension of Isaiah* and mentioned the debt of Milton to rabbinical literature and to Rabbi Eliezer in an appended essay. Within recent years Professors Saurat and Fletcher have described Milton's readings in Hebrew literature and have attempted to establish rabbinical sources for some of Milton's ideas. I wish to follow the suggestion of Laurence by pointing out some interesting relationships between incidents in *Paradise Lost* and the *Pirkê* of Rabbi Eliezer, which was printed in Hebrew in the sixteenth century and in a Latin version by Vorstius in 1644. I do not think of Rabbi Eliezer as a source; he is a symptom of a vast literature that was available to Milton and that certainly accounts for certain things said and done in *Paradise Lost*. I have, consequently, chosen four extra-Biblical events that do not seem to be of Christian provenience but that may be found in Eliezer and in other Hebrew sources as illustrations of Milton's knowledge of this other literature.

In iv, 690-705, we read of the bower "chos'n by the sovran Planter" for the first parents; the idea could be original with Milton, but accounts of Adam's wedding bowers or *נפת* are quite common in rabbinical commentaries.<sup>1</sup> The rabbinical canopies are, however, always artificial in character. We also remember that after the Fall, Eve plans to seduce Adam so that he will die with her and not be given another woman. Saurat finds the source of this notion in the *Zohar*; Fletcher in Yosippon; C. S. Lewis, who is not interested in Milton scholarship, seems to think that Milton invented the notion and gets very excited about the implication.<sup>2</sup>

The idea is also found in Rabbi Eliezer.

The woman went and touched the tree, and she saw the angel of death coming towards her; she said. Woe is me! I shall now die, and the Holy One, blessed be He, will make another woman and give her to Adam, but

<sup>1</sup> *Pirkê* (G. Freedlander, London, 1916), p. 88; *Midrasch Rabbah*: Genesis, 18. 1

<sup>2</sup> *Milton: Man and Thinker* (N. Y., 1925), p. 284; *Milton's Semitic Studies* (Chicago, 1926), p. 132; *Preface to Paradise Lost* (Oxford, 1943), p. 121.

behold I will cause him to eat with me, if we shall die, we shall both die, and if we live, we shall both live <sup>3</sup>

After the Repentance, God dressed Adam and Eve in skins. The Christian exegetes were unable to explain where the skins came from, since they did not like to think of God as a furrier. Milton also boggled at the passage:

As Father of his Familie he clad  
Thir nakedness with Skins of Beasts, or slam,  
Or as the Snake with youthful Coats repaid \* (x. 216-8)

Some of the theologians had wondered about the possibility of animals shedding their skins, but Milton's last line suggests that he knew the legend, related by Eliezer, of God's clothing Adam and Eve in the pelt of the offending serpent.<sup>4</sup> A fourth instance of Milton's knowledge of this material appears in his account of Cain, who slew Abel by smashing him in the "midriff" with a stone (xl. 440-50). The Bible and the theologians say nothing about the means of Abel's murder. Cowley has Cain kill Abel with a stone, because since the Bible is silent, "I had the Liberty to chuse that which I thought most probable."<sup>5</sup> It has usually been thought that Cowley influenced Milton,<sup>6</sup> but Rabbi Eliezer has "He took the stone and embedded it in the forehead of Abel and slew him," an idea not uncommon in Hebrew literature.<sup>7</sup>

D. C. ALLEN

## MILTON AND THE CREATION OF BIRDS

In *Paradise Lost* vii. 417-20, Milton writes:

Meanwhile the tepid caves, and fens, and shores,  
Their brood as numerous hatch'd, from the egg that soon  
Bursting with kindly rupture forth disclos'd  
Their callow young.

So for Milton, as many commentators have noticed, the egg preceded

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 95, *Midrash Rabbah* Genesis 19. 5, see the additional references listed by Ginsberg, *Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1925), I, 74.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 144 and *Targum Yerushalmi* Genesis, 3. 21.

<sup>5</sup> *Poems* (Waller, Cambridge, 1905), p. 270.

<sup>6</sup> R. Kirsten, *Studie über das Verhältnis von Cowley und Milton* (Mennigen, 1899), p. 83.

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 154; *Midrash Rabbah* Genesis, 22 8-9.



the hen, but I think that no one has mentioned the classical justification for this doctrine. The Aristotelian precepts that lie behind the idea are obvious, and Milton probably knew about the Orphic primal egg and the rationalizations of the story of Leda. But there were also a number of essays that were generally known to educated men of the seventeenth century.

The earliest of these essays is the third question in Plutarch's *Symposiaca* where "Which was first, the bird or the egg?" is discussed pro and con by Plutarch, Alexander, Sylla, and the rest. A number of notions from this essay found their way into the *Saturnalia* (vii. 16) of Macrobius where the problem is phrased as "Ovumne prius extiterit an gallina?" Both of these sources are drawn on by the seventeenth century scholar Erycius Puteanus for his *Ovi encomium* which had a wide circulation as part of the *Ampitheatrum*<sup>1</sup> of Dornavius. Students of Milton will remember that Puteanus was the author of *Comus, sive Phaegesisposia Cimmeria, de luxu somnium*, Louvain, 1608.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

### THE BAPTISM OF MILTON'S DAUGHTER MARY

That John Milton's daughter Mary was born on October 25, 1648, about 6 a. m., has been known to all students of his life for a long time, because he himself entered the fact in his own family Bible.<sup>1</sup> That she was also baptized we should naturally take for granted, but I do not remember seeing the record of that act in print.

Joseph Hunter found the entry of the baptism in the parish register of the church of St. Giles in the Fields and noted it in his huge collection of biographical facts called "Chorus Vatum."<sup>2</sup> His account is as follows:

1648. Nov. 7 bap Mary d. of John Milton Esq and Mary his wife. Register of St Giles in the Fields. For this I am indebted to my friend Mr Adams, who has made very large extracts from this & other London Registers.

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* (Hanover, 1619), I, 420-9.

<sup>2</sup> David Masson, *The Life of John Milton*, III, 483, 689; IV, 335. The Bible is Additional MS 32, 310 in the British Museum.

<sup>3</sup> British Museum Additional MS. 24, 491, fol. 191 (also numbered 347). Yale University has a photostatic copy of this whole manuscript.

As a check on the correctness of Hunter's note I wrote to the Rev. E. R. Moore, Rector of the parish church of St. Giles in the Fields, who kindly confirms the accuracy of the entry. Mr. Moore's transcription of the item, which is found under the baptisms for November 7, 1648, reads "Mary, daughter of John Milton, Esq, and Mary, his wife." Here, then, is one tiny additional item to add to our records of Milton's life.

J. MILTON FRENCH

*Rutgers University*

---

### GARRICK AT THE COMÉDIE FRANÇAISE, JUNE 9, 1751

"From thence we went to y<sup>e</sup> *French comedy* & saw *Rodogune* & *Marier Gentilhomme*."<sup>1</sup> The editor had no difficulty in identifying Corneille's tragedy, but could not solve the mystery of the after-piece. He thought that Garrick might have misspelled the title, which might be that of "*Le Gentilhomme Meunier*, an anonymous piece, which had become part of the repertoire in 1678, but was never printed."<sup>2</sup> 1679 is the correct date, but a play first acted in either year that did not attract enough attention to be printed would not have been revived at the Comédie Française over seventy years later. Nor is it likely that Garrick, however badly he spelled, would have put the miller before the nobleman. The editor might have solved the problem by consulting Joannidès,<sup>3</sup> who lists the plays acted at the Comédie Française in 1751. Among them he would have found Legrand's *Usurier Gentilhomme*, evidently the comedy that Garrick had in mind. As Joannidès does not state on what days this play was acted, I also consulted the *Registres* of the Comédie Française, recently made available to me by the generosity of the Modern Language Association of America. There I found that on June 9,<sup>4</sup> 1751, the plays acted were *Rodogune* and the *Usurier Gentilhomme*. The fault was not in Garrick's spelling, but in the editor's reading *Us* as *M*, and *u* as *a*.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

---

<sup>1</sup> R. C. Alexander, *The Diary of David Garrick*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1928, p. 12.

<sup>2</sup> P. 76.

<sup>3</sup> *La Comédie-Française de 1680 à 1900*, Paris, 1901.

<sup>4</sup> May 29, Old Style, which Garrick uses.

## FURTHER REMINISCENCES OF WALT WHITMAN

In the February issue of *The Atlantic Monthly* for 1902, John Townsend Trowbridge<sup>1</sup> published his "Reminiscences of Walt Whitman,"<sup>2</sup> impressions which he included in his autobiography<sup>3</sup> the following year. The two following letters<sup>4</sup> to Trowbridge bear upon these reminiscences directly and indirectly, the first one from Johnston making an immediate reference to them. J. H. Johnston (1837-1919)<sup>5</sup> was a New York jeweler at whose home Whitman was always welcome.

Mr J. T. Trowbridge .

New York, Feb 8th, 1902

My Dear Sir:

For twenty years before his death Walt Whitman was my dearest friend, he was a frequent visitor at my house staying weeks at a time, and he was "Uncle Walt" to my seven children.<sup>6</sup> I was pall-bearer at his funeral and in his will he left me his "Rocking-chair-cane-seated." In 1888 I was wired from Camden "Walt is dying can you get Ingersoll to speak at his funeral" Ingersoll said to me, "Well, J. H., I have read *Leaves of Grass* & have a certain appreciation of Whitman but I don't think I care to speak at his funeral" I said, "All right— now then will you do me a favor Mr Ingersoll?" He said, "yes," and I then told him that I had an 1860 edition of L of G in my library 12 years & it was a sealed book, but in 1872<sup>7</sup> I opened it and it was a revelation to me— now then— I want you to promise me that as soon as you get home (we were in Saratoga) you

<sup>1</sup> John Townsend Trowbridge (1827-1916), editor, poet, novelist, and writer of many books for children, was a man of varied and interesting associations.

<sup>2</sup> *The Atlantic Monthly*, LXXXIX, 163-175 (Feb, 1902).

<sup>3</sup> *My Own Story* (Boston and New York, 1903).

<sup>4</sup> Both letters are in the possession of Mrs. Albert P. Madeira, granddaughter of Trowbridge.

<sup>5</sup> The dates of Johnston and Eldridge were kindly furnished me by Mr. Rollo G. Silver

<sup>6</sup> In a letter dated April 18, 1947, Miss Bertha Johnston writes regarding her father: "He read and thought a good deal; attended the theatre & was popular because of his congenial spirit. But like others of the period, he was tormented by the blasphemous dogma of predestination and, tho' leading an exemplary life, was worried lest he might be fore-doomed to hell-fire. He read Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, Spinoza, but it was 'Leaves of Grass' that finally freed his spirit from this nightmare. Whitman was our guest for a month, March 1877, and my father arranged for an artist-friend, G. W. Waters of Elmira, N. Y. to be with us and paint a portrait of the 'Good Gray Poet,' which is still our prized possession. My father always took with him whenever he traveled, a pocket edition of 'Leaves of Grass' and would buttonhole 'prospects' to read them some favorite poem."

<sup>7</sup> In a later letter, dated May 18, 1947, Miss Johnston writes in part:

will re-read L of G with your 28 years of added experience." He agreed to do it— and he did it— and the result was he became an ardent Whitmanite & as Walt did not die in 88, he in 1890 at my request wrote & delivered his wonderful lecture on Walt & I had the pleasure of handing Walt \$390<sup>8</sup> at a little supper after the lecture<sup>9</sup> (this was in Phila.) and Ingersoll delivered his funeral oration, one of the grandest he ever delivered.<sup>10</sup>

In 1893 The Walt Whitman Fellowship was organized & I have been President of the New York branch since that time, and I write to ask you if you will not be a guest of Honor at a dinner which we will give here next month, any night but Friday of any week—

Your article in the Feb *Atlantic* is by all odds the finest tribute to Walt I have read in years, and is it not wonderful the growth of the Whitman spirit?

With kindest regards— believe me

Very sincerely yours,

J. H. Johnston

The second letter is a reply to Trowbridge's inquiry regarding earlier experiences in Washington, D. C., experiences which bulk large in Trowbridge's own memoirs. Charles W. Eldridge (1840-1903) was the junior partner of Thayer and Eldridge, the Boston firm which published the third (1860) edition of *Leaves of Grass*. The company failed because of the Civil War and later Eldridge worked for several years in Washington as a clerk in the tax revenue department. During the years 1863-4 Whitman, Trowbridge, and he met for lively discussions<sup>11</sup> at the home of William Douglas O'Connor.<sup>12</sup> Eldridge was a life-long friend of Whitman.

Washington, D. C, April 12, '02

My Dear Mr. Trowbridge:

Your letter of February 21 came duly to hand and would have been answered before but I sent it to our old friend, Mrs O'Connor, now Mrs.

" . . . in 1860 my father bought the third edition of *Leaves of Grass*. But it was in 1872 that he re-read it and was thrilled by it, after 12 years of being uninterested. He wrote to Whitman & received a charming letter in reply. A few months later he went to Camden where the poet was living with his brother George on Stevens St. He had had his first stroke of paralysis & came slowly down the stairs, using a cane. The pleasant interview lasted two hours. It was in 1877 that he visited us for the first time, staying for a month. He was our guest again in 1878 when he came on to attend the funeral of William Cullen Bryant. In 1881 he was our guest again for over six weeks."

<sup>8</sup> Holloway makes this amount \$869.00. See *Whitman* (New York, 1927), p. 303.

<sup>9</sup> See the account by Bliss Perry, *Whitman* (Boston and New York, 1906), p. 255.

<sup>10</sup> See *ibid.*, p. 271.

<sup>11</sup> See Trowbridge, *My Own Story*, p. 376

<sup>12</sup> William Douglas O'Connor (1832-1889), one of Whitman's most ardent disciples, first met Whitman in the office of Thayer and Eldridge.

Calder,<sup>13</sup> who resides in Providence, R. I. on the chance that she might remember the conversation to which you alluded— she has just returned the letter (her health not being very good she was unable to respond sooner) and she says “I do not directly remember the conversation, but well recall many things Walt said about that” She further says how much she liked you and wishes she could see you. I would suggest that if you ever visit Providence you call upon her. She is now a *widow* for the second time and resides at 306 Hope Street. As for myself I have no recollection of any conversation whatever between you and Walt occurring at that time. I only remember meeting you then at O'Connor's.

It is my intention to put all I remember and know about Walt in a book before I die.

I knew him about 30 years, and during ten of those years as intimately, probably, as one ever knows another. I know and believe that he was a great man, also a good man, and the most truly pious person I have ever personally known. He never would admit, nor even allow any person in his presence to suggest, without rebuke, that the Divine Order of the Universe could ever have been changed or improved, or that there was any ultimate imperfection anywhere. “That perfect monster which the world ne'er saw” which means Walt Whitman as drawn by Dr. Bucke,<sup>14</sup> will have his appearance very much changed under the light of truth. My book if it ever get printed, will prick many a bubble blown by Walt's ill-informed admirers. Traubel with his Whitmanian twaddle, makes me “green-sick” as William O'Connor was fond of saying in expressing disgust. Traubel's attempt (and others) to make Walt out a socialist, or an anarchist is the most utter mis-representation— the fact is that Walt was one of the most conservative of men. He believed in the old ways, the family with one wife and many children. The homestead fee simple, & the present order of society. I heard several talks between him and Albert Brisbane,<sup>15</sup> the best informed probably of the American disciples of Fourier, and Walt would not yield one inch that anything could be changed except by long and slow gradations. He had a supreme contempt for reformers generally, and especially for those who were getting up schemes for renovating society off-hand. He delighted in lambasting such people when he got a good chance. Notwithstanding all this, he wrote, perhaps, the most revolutionary book of our time— these facts may be reconciled someday by somebody, but I shall not attempt to talk beyond my powers, which perhaps, it is needless to say, are very limited.

Cordially yours,

Charles W. Eldridge

RUFUS A. COLEMAN

Montana State University

<sup>13</sup> While she was preparing her article on Whitman (“Personal Recollections of Walt Whitman,” *Atlantic*, cxi, 825-34, June 1907), Mrs. Calder visited Trowbridge to consult his Whitman correspondence and to get his own impressions.

<sup>14</sup> Probably *Cosmic Consciousness* (New York, 1901). For a brief discussion of this book see Gay Wilson Allen, *Walt Whitman Handbook* (Chicago, 1946), p. 244. Bucke wrote the first full-sized biography of Whitman.

<sup>15</sup> Albert Brisbane (1809-1890) was one of the most energetic reformers of his day and an ardent disciple of Fourier. For a discussion of Whitman's attitude to the Associationists and reformers in general see Newton Arvin, *Whitman* (New York, 1938), pp. 236-8.

EMERSON'S "DAYS" AND EDWARD YOUNG<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Egbert S. Oliver,<sup>1</sup> in a recent study of the origins and poetic significance of Emerson's "Days," has pointed out that the earliest suggestion of the poem dates back to 1831. In the *Journals* appear the lines:

The days pass over me  
And I am still the same.<sup>2</sup>

Nine years later, in a letter to Margaret Fuller, Emerson spoke of Heaven as walking among us in numerous disguises, so that even the wisest man is deceived, and, he adds, "no one suspects the days to be gods."<sup>3</sup> In 1847 Emerson committed to his journal the passage which was to serve as the outline for his famous poem. "The days come and go like muffled and veiled figures sent from a distant friendly party, but they say nothing, and if we do not use the gifts they bring, they carry them as silently away."<sup>4</sup> When, however, in 1851<sup>5</sup> he came to write the poem, he employed, for the first time, the figure of the days as "daughters of time."

I believe it has not hitherto been noted that Emerson probably drew this figure from Edward Young's *Night Thoughts*. Of Emerson's acquaintance with Young's work there is not the slightest doubt, but the reason for his interest in this eighteenth century poem is certainly open to conjecture. It seems likely, however, that Aunt Mary was chiefly responsible for directing Emerson's attention to the poem. In his essay on "Mary Moody Emerson" he mentions Young among the authors who had been the early reading of his aunt;<sup>6</sup> and in his journal he wrote in 1841: "Milton and Young were the poets endeared to the generation she represented."<sup>7</sup> At

\* Houghton Mifflin and Company have kindly granted the author permission to quote from Emerson's *Journals*

<sup>1</sup> E. S. Oliver, "Emerson's 'Days,'" *New England Quarterly*, xix, 518-524 (Dec., 1946).

<sup>2</sup> *The Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Boston, 1909-1914), II, 388.

<sup>3</sup> *The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (New York, 1939), II, 342

<sup>4</sup> *Journals*, VII, 277.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII, 273-274.

<sup>6</sup> *The Complete Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Boston, 1909-1914), x, 402.

<sup>7</sup> *Journals*, v, 548.

least three times, Emerson drew upon Young for quotation. In a letter to Margaret Fuller we find the Newtonian line. "An un-devout astronomer is mad."<sup>8</sup> In "Circles" appear two more verses from Young, slightly garbled as if set down from memory: "Forgive his crimes, forgive his virtues too, / Those smaller faults, half converts to the right."<sup>9</sup> And in "Worship" he included the line, again slightly altered, "Heaven kindly gave our blood a moral flow."<sup>10</sup>

From these quotations, all typical of the religious thinking of Young, we may turn to a passage in Night VIII:

Man is a tale of narrative old Time;  
Sad tale, which high as Paradise begins;  
As if, the toil of travel to delude,  
From stage to stage, in his eternal round,  
The days, his daughters, as they spin our hours  
On fortune's wheel, where accident unthought  
Oft, in a moment, snaps life's strongest thread,  
Each, in her turn, some tragic story tells  
With, now and then, a wretched farce between,  
And fills his chronicle with human woes  
Time's daughters, true as those of men, deceive us,  
Not one, but puts some cheat on all mankind  
While in their father's bosom, not yet ours,  
They flatter our fond hopes; and promise much  
Of amiable; but hold him not o'er-wise,  
Who dares to trust them; and laugh round the year,  
At still-confiding, still-confounded, man,  
Confiding, tho' confounded; . . .<sup>11</sup>

Thus the famous opening line of Emerson's poem, "Daughters of Time, the hypocritic days," derives clearly from Young. Yet except for this single striking parallel, Emerson's reliance on Young was slight. To Young the days are indeed hypocritic, flattering confiding man only in the end to deceive him. To the more optimistic Emerson the days are also clothed in deceit. Yet

<sup>8</sup> *Letters*, II, 363. *Of The Complaint, or Night Thoughts* (Glasgow, 1775), p. 307 (Night IX).

<sup>9</sup> *Works*, II, 317, 437. *Of Young, op. cit.*, p. 358 (Night IX). The original text reads: "His crimes forgive' forgive his virtues, too! / Those smaller faults, half converts to the right"

<sup>10</sup> *Works*, VI, 202, 389. *Of Young, op. cit.*, p. 189 (Night VII). The original text reads: "Heav'n kindly gives our blood a moral flow."

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 234-235.

To each they offer gifts after his will,  
Bread, kingdoms, stars, and sky that holds them all.

Man's fate, then, lies in his choice, and the irony of existence comes from the discovery that our choice all too often has been paltry and inadequate.

The genesis of Emerson's "Days" may bear a further relation to the passage, already quoted, from *Night Thoughts*. This relation is suggested in a letter of Mary Moody Emerson, which, according to Professor Rusk, may have been written in reply to one of Emerson's. Just as Young speaks of the days, which are "not yet ours," as still "in their father's bosom"; so Miss Emerson, evidently in reply to some remarks on the same subject by her nephew in 1844, writes of the days as "coming from the Father."<sup>12</sup> Yet the concept of the days as divine, which appears in earlier hints of the poem, was finally rejected.

"Days" was first printed in the *Atlantic Monthly* for November, 1857. When the verses were collected in *May-Day and Other Pieces* (1867), Emerson was shocked to discover that some fastidious editor had altered "Daughters" to "Damsels." In writing to Cabot, Emerson succinctly observed, "'Daughters' was right & shall be."<sup>13</sup>

NELSON F. ADKINS

*New York University*

## A FRAGMENT OF JACOBAN SONG IN THOREAU'S WALDEN

One of the two bits of verse quoted by Thoreau in the second chapter of *Walden*, "Where I Lived, and What I Lived For" (1854), has apparently not been familiar to editors of this popular anthology selection. The lines that bear no annotation are these:

There was a shepherd that did live,  
And held his thoughts as high  
As were the mounts whereon his flocks  
Did hourly feed him by.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>12</sup> *Letters*, III, 232. Professor Rusk paraphrases the part of Miss Emerson's letter from which we have quoted.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, v, 518. Letter dated May 10, [1867].

<sup>1</sup> *The Writings of Henry David Thoreau* (Boston: The Riverside Press, 1906), II, 98.



It may be of interest to future editors and to students of Thoreau's reading that the poem containing the lines *verbatim* was set by the composer Robert Jones in 1611 as the ninth song in *The Muses Gardin for Delights, or the Fift Booke of Ayres*. This fact does not supply the authorship, of course, for there is no reason to suppose that Jones or any one poet wrote the texts in the volume.<sup>2</sup>

Nor is it as yet easy to say where Thoreau could have known the poem. In 1812 a copy of the *Gardin* existed in the library of the Marquis of Stafford, for in that year William Beloe, in the sixth volume of his *Anecdotes*, printed from it half a dozen poems, not including the one quoted by Thoreau. In 1888 A. H. Bullen, unable to find the *Gardin* in the British Museum, printed in his second song-collection, *More Lyrics*, only the six songs that he could find in Beloe. Apparently, then, if Thoreau did not use some obscure excerpt from Jones or, less likely, the same source as Jones, he must have had access to a forgotten copy of the *Gardin*. The exactness with which he quotes, among other considerations, virtually eliminates oral tradition as a possible source

HOWARD SCHULTZ

University of New Hampshire

---

## REVIEWS

---

Adelbert von Chamisso's "*Peter Schlemihl*." Von ULRICH BAUMGARTNER (*Wege zur Dichtung*, Band XLII). Frauenfeld-Leipzig, Huber & Co., 1944. Pp. 128.

Eichendorff's *Erlebnis und Gestaltung der Sinnenwelt*. Von RENÉ WEHRLI (*Wege zur Dichtung*, Band XXXII). Frauenfeld-Leipzig, Huber & Co., 1938. Pp. 279.

Es ist vielleicht nicht ganz gerecht, zwei Arbeiten wie die vorliegenden nebeneinander zu stellen und zu vergleichen, und doch

<sup>2</sup> The first modern editor was unable to trace any of Jones's texts. See W. B. Squire, ed., *The Muses Gardin* (Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1901), p. iv. Jones's work has now been made easily accessible by inclusion in E. H. Fellowes, ed., *English Madrigal Verse* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1920). Thoreau's quotation appears on p. 542

fordern sie dazu in mancher Weise geradezu heraus. Nicht nur, dass sich beide mit Gegenständen befassen, die demselben historischen Zusammenhang angehören: selbst in ihrer formalen Anlage haben sie manches miteinander gemein. Auf der anderen Seite aber sind sie doch ihrem eigenen methodischen Gang gefolgt, in dem sich die anders gerichteten Interessen ihrer Verfasser ausdrücken. Baumgartners Chamisso-Studie—die bei weitem kürzere und gedrungenere von beiden—geht, wenigstens in ihren besten Teilen, analytisch und psychologisch vor, während Wehrli Eichendorffs Dichtung mehr beschreibt als er sie analysiert; ein rein deskriptives Verfahren aber dringt selten so tief in den inneren Mechanismus dichterischen Schaffens vor wie die ästhetisch-psychologische Analyse. Die letzte Bewertung der beiden Arbeiten ist damit bereits angedeutet.

Baumgartner hat den *Peter Schlemihl* in den Mittelpunkt seiner Untersuchung gestellt, die sich aber darüber hinaus mit dem "Weltgefühl" und den Hintergründen des Chamissoschen Werkes im allgemeinen beschäftigt. An Hand der frühen Arbeiten des Dichters demonstriert er, wie im *Schlemihl* tatsächlich die dichterischen Hauptlinien zusammenlaufen, die er dann in den späteren Veröffentlichungen in ihrem Abklingen noch einmal aufzuzeigen versucht. Da das Werk des späten Chamisso aber unter ganz neuen Eindrücken stand und daher ganz anders orientiert ist, musste die Darstellung dieser späten Manifestationen—eben weil sie aus der Perspektive des Frühwerkes gesehen sind—notwendig fragmentarisch bleiben. Trotzdem hat sich Baumgartner doch mit Erfolg bemüht, die wesensmässige Einheit des Gesamtwerkes in allen seinen Phasen herauszuarbeiten. Er hat fraglos richtig gesehen, dass dies Werk das Produkt eines höchst komplizierten Menschen ist, der sich selbst mit seiner Umwelt nicht in Einklang bringen konnte und der, so sehr er sich auch um eine Lösung bemühte, den Bruch zwischen sich und seiner Zeit nicht zu überwinden verstand. Als Hauptergebnis dieser Studie hat deswegen der Beweis zu gelten, dass die innere Disharmonie und Komplexität des *Schlemihl*, wie überhaupt dessen ganze Thematik, aus dem Wesen des Dichters selbst gedeutet werden müssen, und dass es nicht genügt, diese Dichtung einseitig aus Chamissos Leiden an seiner politischen Heimatlosigkeit abzuleiten.

Die Frage dagegen, ob der *Schlemihl* wirklich in der kurzen Zeitspanne von August bis September 1813 entstanden ist, oder ob Chamisso "im Jahre 1808 mit dem Schattenverlustmotiv beschäftigt war," wird kaum so eindeutig zu beantworten sein, wie der Verfasser anzunehmen scheint. Denn was von ihm (auf Seite 37/8) an Argumenten für die Theorie einer längeren Entstehungszeit

angeführt wird, liesse sich doch z. T. auch gerade für die Annahme eines wirklich spontanen Entstehens geltend machen. Doch wenn hier keine eindeutige Lösung gefunden worden ist, so ist das Problem immerhin intelligent aufgerollt und durchdacht worden.

Auf den letzten vierzig Seiten (dem zweiten und dritten Teil der Studie) hat der Verfasser schliesslich noch versucht, Chamisso in den historischen Zusammenhang einzuordnen und eine zusammenfassende "Wesensbestimmung" vorzunehmen. Diese Teile der Arbeit, die wie zwei angefügte Anhänge dastehen, sind leider völlig unzureichend und auch methodisch unbefriedigend. Auf den zehn, der "Wesensbestimmung" gewidmeten Seiten wird dem Vorausgegangenen nichts Neues zugefügt, und die historische Übersicht im zweiten Teil steht in keiner Weise auf dem kritischen Niveau des Hauptteiles: nur einige wirklich recht oberflächliche Linien werden hinüber und herüber gezogen, die gar nichts besagen. Es scheint, als ob der Verfasser sich nur widerwillig auf ihm unbekanntes Gelände gewagt hatte.

Wehrli's Eichendorff-Arbeit ist in jeder Hinsicht kompetent. Man merkt dem Autor eine gewisse Verliebtheit in seinen Dichter an, die ihn aber in keinem Augenblick zu unkritischer Schwärmerei verleitet. Viel Neues erfährt man aus dieser an sich schonen Studie freilich nicht. Mit feinem Einfühlungsvermögen ist Wehrli den einzelnen Zügen der dichterischen Natur Eichendorffs nachgegangen, ohne dass sich seine Ergebnisse klar und einfach zusammenfassen liessen. Im ersten Teil ("Erlebnis") sind die mannigfaltigen Elemente der Eichendorffschen Welt zusammengetragen, und im zweiten ("Gestaltung") ist ihre Bewältigung im Werk selbst untersucht worden. Das Hauptstück der Arbeit ist fraglos das lange Kapitel über "Vergleich und Verkörperung," in dem die dichterischen Vergleiche Eichendorffs genauer dargestellt worden sind. Man muss anerkennen, dass in dieser Arbeit eine grosse Menge von Material zusammengetragen worden ist, aber man muss sich doch auch hin und wieder fragen, ob der Verfasser nicht ein wenig zu hemmungslos zitiert hat. Sicher hatten die Ergebnisse auf die Hälfte der Seitenzahl zusammengedrängt werden können, und das nicht nur aus Rücksicht auf den Leser sondern auch im Interesse der Arbeit selbst.

Es ist vielleicht nicht unangebracht, an dieser Stelle einmal auf die nicht nur in jeder Beziehung zuverlässige sondern auch wirklich schöne Form hinzuweisen, die der Verlag dieser Schriftenreihe gegeben hat und immer wieder gibt. Was hier rein technisch geleistet worden ist, ist mustergültig.

WOLFGANG PAULSEN

*Shakespeare's "Histories": Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy.* By LILY B. CAMPBELL. San Marino, California: The Huntington Library, 1947. Pp. xii + 346 \$6.75.

In *Shakespeare's "Histories"* Lily B. Campbell poses the initial problem of why histories are histories; concludes that the history plays are what they are because of Elizabethan conceptions of history; expounds the contemporary view of history as a record which, having as its subject iterative, meaningful processes, is a source of political wisdom; and interprets five of Shakespeare's plays as commentaries upon the politics of his day—"Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy." In writing *King John* Shakespeare altered the chronicle-material to make the play reflect four current problems—Elizabeth's right to the throne, the pope's right to depose a king, the right to rebel, the king's answerability to God alone. *Richard II* speaks on the problem of deposition which was much argued during Elizabeth's reign. *Henry IV* reflects Elizabethan concern with the problem of rebellion; the northern rebellion of 1569 provided a pattern for the play; and Falstaff and his mates are Shakespeare's comment on conditions in the army. *Henry V* gives expression to Tudor theories of war and peace, deriving its views of military discipline from the articles of war, and finding its comedy in disputes on military theory. In *Richard III*, which is tragedy (private morals) as well as history play (public morals), there are suggestions of the careers of Leicester and Cecil, as well as presentations of contemporary conceptions of revenge. The reading of these plays, and often of rather small parts of them, in terms of Tudor history and thought is ingenious and impressive.

Miss Campbell's critical premise in *Shakespeare's "Histories"* is identical with that of her previous study, *Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes*, which endeavored to explain the tragic protagonists in terms of Elizabethan concepts of the passions:<sup>1</sup> in both studies she hunts for the significance of works of art in contemporary ideas outside, and not necessarily concerned with, the art work and its genus. Within limits the process rewards us with useful historical knowledge: in the more recent work we learn the reason for some of the changes which Shakespeare made in his source-material, and the ways in which Elizabethan audiences could see their own times reflected in the plays. But how much intrinsic knowledge of the works of art we gain is another question. The jacket of *Shakespeare's "Histories"* tells us that Miss Campbell's work is "essential to an understanding of the playwright, of his histories, and of

<sup>1</sup> The dangers of this process have since been skillfully pointed out by Louise C. Turner Forest in "A Caveat for Critics Against Invoking Elizabethan Psychology," *PMLA*, LXi (1946), 651-672. She remarks that we have "shrouded in a mist of humors the firm, clear ethics on which it [Elizabethan poetry] depends" (p. 653) and that Hamlet is thus "reduced to a diseased state of mind, to a mere humor" (p. 654).

Elizabethan politics." This statement, however, is vastly in need of qualification. What the jacket might legitimately claim is that the book is a study of an aspect of the Elizabethan mind, namely, its sensitivity to historical parallels, particularly as this is exhibited in literary works.

No author, of course, is responsible for his jacketeers. But Miss Campbell herself insists that "history" (i. e., history plays) will be "better understood when we stop talking about it in terms of ancient classical dramatic genres and consider it in relation to historical writing exemplified alike in dramatic and non-dramatic literature" (Preface). Again, "It is drama, but it cannot be understood by studying alone its dramatic technique" (p. 116), and "if Shakespeare's play is considered as a history play, . . . it is to the pattern of events in Elizabeth's reign rather than to dramatic genius that we must look for the explanation" (p. 136). But many critics will insist uncompromisingly that to understand drama we must always look primarily to "dramatic genius" as it is exhibited in "dramatic technique," and that to understand historic drama we must look precisely to the classical genres, to tragedy and comedy—that is, seek out the determinants of structure and tone which exhibit the work as being one kind of artistic organism or another. This necessity, as well as the fact that the process does not exclude the possibility of studies in historical contexts that may be stimulatingly informative, is quite apparent to another student in Miss Campbell's present territory—E. M. W. Tillyard. In *Shakespeare's History Plays* (1946) Tillyard is primarily engaged in historicism: he establishes the Tudor concept of history as a moral continuum in which chaos gives way before the reassertion of cosmic order, and shows how Shakespeare, deriving less from Holinshed than from Hall and the Morality tradition, embodies this concept in a series of plays eight of which form two tetralogies. But he is also very much concerned with the quality of the plays which are subject to such influences, and we find him evaluating stylistic differences, analyzing imagery, tracing theme, and taking into account the structural significance of all the ingredients; whereas Miss Campbell rests in a notation of the influences. Miss Campbell tells us that Shakespeare was of his time; Tillyard establishes that Shakespeare belonged to the intellectual aristocracy of his time. Miss Campbell says that *Henry V* is more unified than *Henry IV*; Tillyard accounts critically for the fact that *Henry V* is the less successful play. Miss Campbell regards Falstaff as structurally excrement, and can accommodate him in her historical schema only by making him and his fellows a representation of conditions in the army; Tillyard (like Dover Wilson and Cleanth Brooks in other works) knows that Falstaff is of the essence of the play and asserts, as his basic proposition, that he "enlarges the play, as none of Shakespeare's hitherto had been enlarged, into the

ageless, the archetypal." Perhaps these two treatments of this one character, which are paralleled by the discussions of other points common to both works, are good symbols of the two critical methods and their potentialities. Tillyard is certainly the historian, but he is also the critic, whose function is the elucidation of the values which transcend the author's own age, on the other hand the mere historian, who rests in the detection of local and temporal relevancies (which, if total knowledge is the criterion, are not without their significance), simply parochializes the work of art and makes it ultimately uninteresting.

To state the theoretical issue in another way: a literary work may be studied in terms of external or internal relationships. The former are those with the author—his life, mind, "humor," etc.—and with his period—its history, language, ideas, knowledge, etc., to uncover them may yield fascinating historical and biographical knowledge, and it may even be a preliminary to the securing of literary knowledge proper. This latter knowledge, this ultimate object of literary study, must come chiefly from the knowledge of internal relationships—relationships, in poetic drama, of character, action, and image. The form of the work defines its substance. Only by mastering the form, the inner reality, may the student, ironically enough, see the work in its important external relationship—the relationship with human truth that is restricted to no time and place.

These speculations would be supererogatory, and the comparisons ungracious, if Miss Campbell did not show her awareness of the critical problem, and take her stand, in Chapter 1. There, in challenging various Shakespearians, she disagrees especially with Mark Van Doren (a number of whose Shakespeare criticisms Tillyard quotes approvingly) for his "comfortable postulate" that "a whole heart and a free mind" are the chief tools essential to Shakespearian study. "Any heart and any mind will do," comments Miss Campbell, somewhat energetically knocking down a straw man. Van Doren is not turning loose "any" reader as a Shakespeare critic, and he pays due tribute to Shakespeare scholars; but he is insisting that grasp of internal relationships is the final mark of the critic. Of that achievement Miss Campbell, resourceful as she is within her own limits, stops short.

ROBERT B. HELLMAN

*University of Washington*

---

*As They Liked It, An Essay on Shakespeare and Morality*, by  
ALFRED HARBAGE. The Macmillan Company, New York,  
1947. Pp. xiii + 238. \$2.75.

This provocative essay is one more sign that we are rediscovering the moral foundations of great art. Professor Harbage casts an

ironical glance upon Art for Art's Sake and George Moore's effort to make an *Anthology of Pure Poetry*, free from the taint of moral suggestion. And he turns a not too reverent eye upon the fashion of criticism most prevalent among scholars. "There is actually no such thing as 'historical' or 'objective' criticism — except possibly in matters of prosody and the like. With the first step into the realm of larger meanings, the subjective element enters in." "It is of the nature . . . of great art that it mean many things to many men." Mr. Harbage pleads, therefore, "for the authority of Shakespearean criticism as a whole, against that present-day portion of it that would nullify all the rest."

As the older critics perceived, the plays afford a constant moral stimulus. To this we respond "morally, and therefore earnestly and in diverse ways." Yet Shakespeare's "purpose was only to please," not instruct. In *King Lear* he gave to a "homely truth a wonderful, a beautiful investiture," but it is a truth we already knew. "Shakespearean drama is a highroad leading nowhere," but "*nowhere* means *home*—the fundamental convictions of men." The dramatist has to "utilize the moral nature of his audience to satisfy its appetite for pleasure."

Mr. Harbage devotes his first three chapters to presenting this simple but illuminating concept. He gives four more to showing how complex may be Shakespeare's moral stimulus and our response. Shakespeare portrays good and evil as interpenetrable and relative. He depicts even Goneril, Richard III, and Iago as not purely evil; and surrounds even Desdemona, in the beginning of the play, with an "aura of suspicion . . . not purely of Iago's creation." He complicates his effects by allowing humorists to attack honor, study, conscience, virginity, and peace. He creates in Falstaff an amazing paradox to which no critic's analysis can do justice. He has given a "moral ambiguity" to the character of Angelo, and has made Hamlet an "enduring moral enigma." He has given his three most famous utterances on order and degree to three unscrupulous politicians, and he never has a wholly reliable spokesman. In spite of his moral stimulus, Shakespeare remains the supreme artist, whose aim is only to please.

The most original part of Mr. Harbage's criticism, perhaps, is in the seven chapters described above, which he groups together as Part One under the subtitle "Pleasurable Excitement." Part Two he calls "Pleasurable Reassurance." In the fables of comedy or tragedy, where the poet is free to invent, and in history, where he is bound by supposed fact, Shakespeare makes clear the presence of justice in human affairs. Even in his darker pictures, he portrays "a safe majority" of his people as more good than bad. He loves to dwell on the virtue of compassion and the sense of human solidarity. Life is good. It has an "attainable goal"—not "fame or wealth or power or position," but normal, human happiness—song and dance, merry talk and occasional feasting, comradeship and family love.

In all this, Mr. Harbage has succeeded in one of his aims—"to say something applicable to play-writing and novel-writing today." Moreover, he has produced a book of genuine criticism, often illuminating and always sane and provocative. No mere summary can suggest the variety of allusion to every play by Shakespeare—even *The Two Noble Kinsmen*—or the wealth of fresh comment on the standing problems of Shakespearean criticism. Particularly notable, for example, is a paragraph on the character of Richard the Second. The entire essay is a model of lucidity, persuasiveness, and courtesy. It deserves a wide and sympathetic public.

And yet the prudent reader will be on his guard. Is it true that "Richard the Third is the incarnation of political misrule rather than of moral error"? Does Hamlet's casual remark, "There is nothing either good or bad but thinking makes it so," prove anything about Shakespeare's views on the relativity of morals? Can we believe Goneril's charge about the riotousness of Lear's knights? To whom does Lear, in cursing her, seem "less sinned against than sinning"?

Apart from details, there is the central question whether Shakespeare's "purpose was only to please." He seems to have said it was, in the epilogues to one history and several comedies; but he has said nothing of the sort in any of the tragedies. Here, surely, his aim was "to hold the mirror up to nature"—to reveal life and interpret its deepest meanings. It is hardly sufficient to say, à propos of *King Lear*, that "plays which make us look at [evil], hate it, and pity its victims do not offend our sense of justice." The death of Cordelia shocked the sense of justice in Johnson and Bradley, and Shakespeare seems to have meant it to shock any audience. We may heartily agree that he does not give way to despair, but may still feel that Mr. Harbage's analysis, though necessarily brief, is needlessly oversimplified.

His discussion of objective and historical criticism invites a similar comment. We need his reminder that great art means many things to many men. But in the theater, most people do not respond as isolated individuals. They respond as a crowd, and a great actor can be master of the crowd. Macklin and Irving created different Shylocks, but each actor got the effect he intended. Shakespeare's own fellow actors, trained under his eye, must have had similar success, and the response they got must have been very nearly what Shakespeare intended.

One fact is inescapable: the common response of Shakespeare's audience, as of any other, depended on their common beliefs and feelings. In proportion as the critic knows what these were, he can—if he is cautious and perceptive—understand the probable response of the Elizabethan audience and therefore the probable intention of Shakespeare. If, for example, he considers the sympathy with which Shakespeare always depicts a selfless loyalty, if he recalls that egoism was regarded as the chief of the deadly sins, and



if he notes the disloyalty and naked egoism of Iago's first speeches, then he will ask how the poet could accept Mr. Harbage's picture of Iago as—in the beginning—an amusing devil enamored of self-expression. The historical critic is not infallible; but he may approach ever nearer to the poet's real meaning, and may gain at times an insight into certain human values which our generation has often neglected.

KENNETH O. MYRICK

*Tufts College*

---

*Plato and Milton.* By IRENE SAMUEL. Ithaca, New York: Cornell Univ. Press, 1947. Cornell Studies in English, xxxv. Pp. xi + 182. \$2.00.

Miss Samuel's justification of the publication of this study rests on her assumption that she has enough to add to Herbert Agar's *Milton and Plato* (Princeton University Press, 1928) to warrant the printing of another study of the relation between these two great poets—for she insists that at times Plato is a poet in all but metrical form. Her opinion seems to be sound. By approaching her topic from different standpoints from Agar's and by extending somewhat her interpretation of the influence of Plato on Milton, she has produced a study which will be valuable to students of Milton and of Platonic influences in the England of his time.

Her arrangement, as well as her selection of material, differs from Agar's. His book has chapters on Milton's knowledge of Plato, Milton's debt to Plato, and Milton's place in the history of Platonism, a brief conclusion, an appendix of 40 pages consisting of quotations from Milton referring to or depending on Plato, and a bibliography. Miss Samuel divides her book into (1) Milton as a student of Plato, (2) "academics old and new" (i. e., the followers of Plato), (3) "himself a true poet" (the dedicated poet), (4) "the good life: pleasure, wealth, and fame," (5) "the good life: knowledge," (6) the theory of ideas, (7) the doctrine of love, (8) an extensive bibliography, and (9) a good index.

Near the beginning of the book (pp. 4-5) Miss Samuel quotes Milton's lyrical praise of "the divine volumes of Plato and his equal Xenophon" from the *Apology for Smectymnuus*. All the way from his earliest college poems and prolusions to *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes* she finds the same pervasive influence. A good illustration is her use of *Paradise Regained*. One of the most interesting facts about her study is that this poem, in which Milton more sternly than in any other work rebuffs Plato as the man who "to fabling fell and smooth conceits," is drawn upon very often for illustrations of his Platonic philosophy. The necessity laid upon the poet to teach and teach wisely (p. 64), Satan's use of pleasure,

wealth, and fame as temptations (pp. 77, 83, 93), and Christ's opinion of knowledge (p. 122) are all traced to Platonic sources. The index shows some 40-50 pages on which this poem is mentioned.

Several sections of the book deserve commendation. (1) Miss Samuel's emphasis on the development of Milton's Platonism, (2) her liberal definition of Plato's influence on Milton, (3) the interesting light which she sheds on "the last infirmity of noble minds" in *Lycidas*, and (4) her analysis of Milton's use of Plato's doctrine of love. As to the first point, Miss Samuel wisely emphasizes time and again (e. g., pp. 49, 59, 70, 147) that Milton's Platonism, which during his early life was somewhat perfunctory and imitative, had become an organic part of his life and thought by the time he wrote his three great poems. On the second point, Miss Samuel states well (p. 16) "if we ask to which realm of Milton's thought Platonic doctrine is the key, the answer must be to all of it, since for Milton as for Plato, the parts of life are not separate, but in organic unity . . . we can distinguish only phases, not disjunct components, of his philosophy." This broad study of similarities between the two men is more effective than mere references to Milton's mentions of Plato's name—though it of course poses dangers which the more conservative method would escape. Third, though Miss Samuel never comments specifically on Milton's much discussed phrase about fame as "the last infirmity of noble minds," her section on fame (pp. 86-95) has helped at least this one reader to understand Milton's thought better. She points out (p. 86) that although Plato grants to the *philosophoi* (lovers of wisdom and virtue) the highest place in his scheme, he gives the second highest rank to the *philotimoi* (lovers of honor). The only handicap of the second group is the love of fame. The *philosophoi* are best because they wish "to deserve esteem," whereas the *philotimoi* "primarily regard the esteem, whether or not it is duly earned." Three pages later she quotes the "last infirmity" line (p. 89), but unfortunately without clinching the application. Finally, she offers a good analysis of Plato's doctrine of love, relating it to the condition of Satan as regards his theories about "Hell of Heav'n" and "myself am Hell" (pp. 160-161), Milton's distinction between love and lust (p. 161), Eve as Adam's "other self" (p. 163), the degrees and kinds of love (p. 165), the fall of man (p. 166), and even the story of *Samson Agonistes* (pp. 168 ff.). These, with numerous other good criticisms, make the book useful.

On the other hand, it has some shortcomings. One, which is not serious, concerns the textual quotations from Milton. Although Miss Samuel professes to take these from the Columbia edition of Milton, she diverges from it on an average of nearly once in every two or three lines. If she wishes to modernize or change spelling, punctuation, and the like, she should explain her procedure. Two other shortcomings seem more serious. (1) defects in the otherwise fine chronological table of Milton's references to Plato (pp. 22-25) and

(2) inconsistency between the organization of the book and the analysis of Platonic doctrines (pp. 96-99).

The table, which would seem to purport to be a complete list of Milton's references to Plato, is not so clear as it should be. First, it omits about a dozen items which appear in Patterson's *Index*, but without explanation of the omissions. Second, it adds some fifteen items not in Patterson but without the asterisk which she says she uses to mark such additions. Third, though it gives references to Agar for many items, it omits without explanation about 50 from his list of 77. The compilation of such a table of allusions is an excellent idea, and one wishes that it had been broadened to include all the quotations which she uses throughout the book; but the drawbacks just mentioned rob it of part of its usefulness.

One is also bothered by the entire lack of agreement between the organization of the book into chapters and the analysis of Plato's doctrines given on pp. 96-99, which one would suppose should be the skeleton of the whole book. This analysis divides Plato's teachings into ethics (subdivided into love, knowledge, virtue, fame, and amusement), politics (the ideal state, law, the ruler, education, marriage, and liberty), theories of art (poetry, rhetoric, and music), and metaphysics (the cosmos, the ideas). In addition to wondering at the placing of some of these topics, one is surprised to find that none of the topics from politics or from theories of art are covered, and only one of those from metaphysics. Even those which are treated come in totally different order.

In general it seems fair to say that although the arrangement of this book leaves something to be desired, Miss Samuel's understanding of both Milton and Plato is thorough, her style is interesting, and her perception of the similarities between them is stimulating to any reader who wishes to learn more about the intellectual springs at which the author of *Paradise Lost* drank. Although not so interesting as some recent studies of the sources of the inspiration of Coleridge, Keats, Chaucer, and other poets, this book has something of the same appeal as those.

J. MILTON FRENCH

*Rutgers University*

---

*The Letters and Private Papers of William Makepiece Thackeray.*

Collected and Edited by GORDON N. RAY. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. Vol. I (Pp. clxxiii, 522) and Vol. II (Pp. viii, 853), 1945; Vol. III (Pp. viii, 695) and Vol. IV (Pp. x, 586), 1946.

The first collected edition of the correspondence of William Makepiece Thackeray has made its appearance. It contains over

1600 of Thackeray's letters, more than half of which have never before appeared and many of which are now for the first time printed in their entirety—all enlivened by the innumerable sketches and orthographical eccentricities that distinguished Thackeray's epistolary manner. The edition also contains letters to Thackeray, diaries and journals, and other relevant items of biographical worth. Numerous appendices deal with special considerations, including the identification of early articles by Thackeray. The indexes are bountiful, and the documentation and critical commentary are a measure of the editor's great patience, industry, and scholarship.

This publication has been made possible by the sanction and aid of Thackeray's grandchildren and literary heirs, Mrs. Richard Fuller and W. T. D. Ritchie, who have finally decided that the hitherto somewhat nebulous figure of their grandfather may gain rather than suffer by the release of the family correspondence. The wisdom of their decision is apparent in a work in which Thackeray, certainly not finally but certainly more graphically than before, appears in imposing integrity.

The greatest number of heretofore unpublished letters that appear in this collection are those of Thackeray to his family now in the possession of Mrs. Fuller. Of these the ones written by Thackeray to his mother are the most numerous. Equally important are those written to Mrs. Brookfield and published here from transcripts also in Mrs. Fuller's possession. In none of all these are there any startling new disclosures; but what in the past has been sketchy and vague is here implemented and illuminated.

"I cannot live without the tenderness of some woman," wrote Thackeray to Mrs. Brookfield in 1853; and his letters to this lady, to his wife, and to his mother consistently amplify this theme. The influence of these women upon his conduct and his work is made, in Mr. Ray's volumes, more clearly apparent than ever before. But it is regrettable that all the letters to Mrs. Brookfield and to her friends Mrs. Elliot and Miss Kate Perry now in the possession of A. S. W. Rosenbach were not available for this collection. Mr. Ray has obtained from Mrs. Fuller, however, transcripts of some of these, and in an appendix he has printed certain excerpts from others that appeared in the Lambert and the Goodyear auction catalogues. It may be just possible that Mr. Ray has here been embarrassed by the unhappily conflicting interests of the lamp and of the counting-house.

Many letters, according to Mr. Ray, are still to be collected and printed, and he promises a supplementary volume when he has completed in England his work of search and collection that was interrupted by the war. It is quite likely, he believes, that much of Thackeray's correspondence with Carlyle, Milnes, Leech, and Lady Ashburton, a correspondence not richly represented in the present collection, is extant and available for publication. But unfortunately most of the letters to Edward Fitzgerald, to whom Thackeray wrote

frequently and with the greatest frankness and intimacy, will never be seen. For in 1852 Fitzgerald wrote to Thackeray: "I have been looking over a heap of your letters—from the first in 1831 to the last of some months back—and what do you think I have done with the greater part?—why, burnt them!" In explanation Fitzgerald protested his modesty in the face of Thackeray's complimentary style, and his own fear that the letters would fall into "unwise hands . . . and get published according to the vile fashion of the day." The letters and excerpts saved from this destruction are included here, many of them printed for the first time, most of the rest for the first time in their entirety.

Mr. Ray has brought out his book in bold spite of the extraordinary difficulties that during the last eight years have beset the scholarly world—and the other world too. Begun in 1939, his work in England and France was interrupted by the war, and he was forced to proceed wholly on the basis of American resources. The intricate scholarly apparatus accompanying the letters was produced entirely in this country, and then at the moment of going to press Mr. Ray was called into service in the Navy. The tedious business of conducting his four volumes through the process of printing was supervised by Mr. Howard Mumford Jones, who has thereby placed in his debt many others besides Mr. Ray.

The result of all Mr. Ray's labors and his scholarship—and of the care and graciousness of the many other persons concerned in so elaborate an undertaking—is a book that stands as the present capital work on Thackeray. It has brought the end into view—the end of a somewhat chaotic history of publications beginning with the appearance in 1887 of Mrs. Brookfield's *A Collection of Letters of Thackeray* and continuing through the publications of Lady Ritchie, Lewis Melville, J. G. Wilson, Lucy Baxter, and Mrs. Fuller herself, whose *Thackeray and His Daughter*, published in 1924, was the last substantial preparation for the Thackeray biography. And now Mr. Ray promises that biography.

But even before its appearance the figure of Thackeray, both man and artist, has in these volumes assumed full stature. And, perhaps more transparently than with regard to any other great Victorian, the compelling relationship between the man and his work is now realized. The early uncertainties of Thackeray's life, the besetting fears, the long-drawn sense of insecurity, the dependence upon others, the delayed rewards, the increasing seizures of "spasms," the struggles with the "blue devils"—all these things became a part of his character. And they seem to have forced upon him those compensations which appear almost to have necessitated his continuous dining out and drinking and gormandizing, which enhanced his capacity for friendship, and—what was perhaps most important of all when the hopeless insanity of his wife became apparent—which dictated his flirtations and his deeply serious love of

Jane Brookfield. It is obvious now that no mature work of Thackeray was unaffected by these forces

The long service of Americans to Thackeray—to both the man and the name—began nearly a hundred years ago, when the citizens of this country, north and south, paid good dollars to hear the great man lecture and so laid for him the ground of financial security. In the record of that service Mr. Ray's work is the outstanding scholarly achievement. It is hoped that nothing will stand in the way of his closing the account.

EDWIN M. EVERETT

*University of Georgia*

*Forces in Modern British Literature, 1885-1946.* By WILLIAM YORK TINDALL. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947. xviii + 386 pp. Index. \$4 00.

Concerned less with the development of individual talents than with the general "meanings and values" of British writing since 1885, Mr. Tindall undertakes in this ambitious survey "to show the character of contemporary literature as a whole." Isolating ten central patterns which recur in various proportions throughout the art of his chosen period, he discovers behind a most diffuse creative effort a sort of unity in the theme of "exile," the divorce of the artist from his public. The best books of our time, he insists, are not only beautiful but strange and esoteric; for ours indeed is "the literature of romantic decadence" belonging "to the great romantic movement with which we associate Wordsworth and Rousseau." Nevertheless, a quite unreasonable prejudice against all things "Victorian" betrays Mr. Tindall into discounting or rather sedulously ignoring the aesthetic and intellectual forces which reshaped the entire "romantic" tradition in post-Wordsworthian England, and leads him at the same time to exaggerate the importance of influences from post-Rousseauistic France, which, he seems to believe, alone dominated all serious work of the 'eighties and the decades that followed. The demands of selection, to be sure, have made impossible his treatment of all the complex relationships between modern British literature and its sources and analogues. Yet its character "as a whole" is scarcely intelligible without some understanding of its native antecedents or some passing reference to the parallel achievements of literary America, for instance, which, conditioned in large part by a not dissimilar background, must surely in turn have left their mark on English letters of the past half-century.

Within the spatial and temporal limits, however, to which he confines his study, Mr. Tindall moves with extraordinary confidence and agility. He draws freely upon an almost inexhaustible modern

library, so freely indeed that his themes become at times confused by excessive illustration. And his book, well-indexed and amply documented, constitutes in effect a kind of twentieth-century British bibliography. His style throughout, rich in paradox and irony, has encouraged his publishers to adorn the dust-jacket with choice examples of "Tindalliana." But the wittily contentious opinions that may be so described do much to rob his text of the objectivity it might otherwise possess. Mr. Tindall delights in ranking his favorite books and authors as if they were so many Derby winners at Epsom. Thus "No Victorian novelist is as good as Joyce, and no Victorian poet as good as Yeats"; *A Portrait of the Artist* is "by far the greatest English novel of adolescence," while *Ulysses* is comparable to the best of Milton or of Dante; *Hail and Farewell* is "the outstanding memoir of our times," and *Queen Victoria* is the best biography; Baudelaire is "probably the greatest poet of the nineteenth century"; and *Animal Farm* is "the most brilliant political satire since Swift's." Intrinsically meaningless, pronouncements so oracular serve only to obscure the true critical power which the author brings to his more sober commentaries.

When he chooses to withhold value-judgment, Mr. Tindall attains a descriptive analysis altogether convincing in its depth and sensitivity. Despite occasional overstatement, his explications of Joyce and Yeats, in particular, are both patient and penetrating. And his chapters on naturalism, symbolism, and the stream of consciousness are at once detailed and succinct, erudite and lucid. If his book as a whole reaches no conclusion, the fault lies perhaps as much in his subject-matter as in his approach; for a "literature of romantic decadence," fragmentary, experimental, private, must, by definition, elude forever all final synthesis.

JEROME HAMILTON BUCKLEY

*University of Wisconsin*

---

*Southern Prose Writers*, GREGORY PAINE, ed. American Writers Series, New York. American Book Co., 1947. \$2.50.

In this latest addition to the American Writers Series Professor Paine has been guided by a desire "... to make available to students of American literature southern literary materials not readily available elsewhere and to present these materials in units sufficiently large to be genuinely representative of the authors chosen." Therefore his problem of selection has been extremely difficult and his omissions numerous. Most of these are unimportant except to the special student, but by his omission of Chivers and Timrod and Poe (there is already a Poe volume in the AWS), and because of the nature of his selections from Legaré, Simms, and

Lanier, Professor Paine has almost failed to include literary theory in his types of prose, an aspect of the Southern artistic consciousness important in these men and increasingly characteristic of the work of the Nashville group.

One omission many will regret is Kate Chopin. Though probably Grace King is chosen as contrast to Cable, the superior craftsmanship of the author of "Désirée's Baby" deserves a place in any anthology of Southern prose.

Professor Paine attempts to handle an almost impossible amount of material in his Introduction. In covering the social, economic, and political backgrounds of the South; publishing, libraries, and magazines in the Old South; and the traditions and economics of the New South, he has in the main gathered factual material and frequently has kept theoretical pronouncements and conclusions in the words of his sources. Sometimes the Introduction is almost a parade of facts, as in the section on libraries, but these facts should be valuable to the special student.

Once in a while the critical comments are not particularly enlightening. In contending that William Wirt was not a late neo-classicist and that there was no "cultural lag" in the Richmond of 1800, Professor Paine has it that "In writing his letters [*The Letters of the British Spy*] Wirt was not 'an old-fashioned gentleman,' as literary historians have persisted in calling him, but a 'meek and harmless young man,' in his own phrase . . ." His critical comment on Edwin Mims' *The Advancing South* is that it is "A valuable book, especially encouraging before the depression hit us."

Sometimes his choice of emphasis is surprising. In the closing pages of the Introduction, he expends a paragraph each on James Boyd and Margaret Mitchell and dismisses William Faulkner and Thomas Wolfe with a word as "current writers" on Southern "poor whites." Generally, however, the comments are as adequate as space permits.

The selected bibliography is not extensive, but the listings for general background may be supplemented by the footnotes to the Introduction. Students will find it inconvenient that some of the more valuable references, such as U. B. Phillips' *Life and Labor in the Old South* and the hard-to-find *Views and Reviews* of W. G. Simms are not repeated in the bibliography.

There are a few errors. The DAB article on Harris is listed under Jefferson, the Lanier Centennial Edition is given as nine instead of ten volumes, and Link's *Pioneers of Southern Literature* in one place is called *Pioneers of the South*.

The brief listings for individual authors show how little scholarly work has been done on the literature of the South. Except for the Lanier Centennial and the Virginia Edition of Poe, complete scholarly editions do not exist. Accordingly Professor Paine's attempt to represent a large field in one compact volume has been



hampered, as he himself indicates, by "gaps in our knowledge which must be filled before any important synthesis can be made in the field of southern literature." His indication of the extensiveness of the uncollected and unedited prose of the South should be stimulating to students of American Literature.

ROBERT D. JACOBS

*Johns Hopkins University*

---

*Nathaniel Hawthorne and the Tradition of the Gothic Romance.*

By JANE LUNDBLAD. (Essays and studies in American Language and Literature, No. 4. Upsala, A- and B-Lundequistka Bokh.) Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. 1946.

Miss Lundblad's study of Hawthorne as, to a far greater degree than is generally realized, a borrower from the Gothic romances of Mrs. Radcliffe, Lewis and Mathurin, is the fourth study to come from the American Institute at Upsala. That the director of the Institute and editor of the series is the distinguished Professor S. B. Liljegren, well known in this country, is guarantee of their interest. Professor Liljegren is probably the pioneer promoter in Europe of studies in American philology, and of American civilization as a subject important for Europeans.

Miss Lundblad presents for her European readers a brief account of Hawthorne's background, compiles, from the studies of A. M. Killen and Hélène Richter and from Professor Liljegren's lectures a list of recurring elements in the English Gothic romances which are borrowed by Hawthorne, and shows how he combines these elements of the fantastic and supernatural with native American settings and traditions. Checking such Gothic elements as the castle, the mysterious manuscript, the work of art, Italians, ghosts, magic, blood, against each of Hawthorne's works in chronological order, she establishes the fascination which these held for Hawthorne, from his crude youthful borrowings, wholesale, through the short stories and four novels which present skilful adaptations of the strange and supernatural to conditions in his own land and in Italy, and at last to the various final fragments in which appear not only such hackneyed elements as a castle, an Italian, a Jesuit, a wizard, a strange wine,—but such wild grotesqueries as a bloody footstep and a huge spider.

Miss Lundblad is modestly content to give the facts, and not try to derive from them conclusions as to Hawthorne's flagging energy and taste. She recognizes frankly the limitations of her study of the Gothic romances to secondary sources. Within these

limitations she has worked with intelligence and thoroughness, and has achieved a study both useful in itself and valuable as a portrayal of a great American as he appears to Scandinavian eyes.

Wellesley College

ELIZABETH W. MANWARING

---

### BRIEF MENTION

---

*Johann Gottfried Herder, Journal meiner Reise im Jahre 1769.* Edited by A. GILLIES (Blackwell's German Texts. General Editor J. Boyd), Oxford: 1947. Pp. xli + 173. 7/6. The Blackwell series has been augmented by several new editions during the last two years; I have before me Lessing's *Emilia Galotti* by E. L. Stahl, Grillparzer's *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen* by Douglas Yates, James Boyd's *Notes* to his edition of Goethe's *Poems* (which I shall review later) and the above mentioned Herder Diary by Alexander Gillies. The texts are tersely annotated and provided with introductions which, presupposing a general knowledge of the author's biography, devote their thirty to forty pages to an expert and scholarly discussion of the problem of the work, its literary setting and its artistic form and merit. They may well be used in our graduate classes and would save our blushing over the pony translations and elementary vocabularies on which our publishers insist since the old classics' editions have died out. As the Herder Diary is not accessible to our students in any separate edition, it should be especially welcome. Mr. Gillies' indispensable annotations do not stop at mere factual data but elucidate the text with references to contemporaneous authors and Herder's own writings. The introduction vivifies and clarifies the stormy conflict between contending thoughts and emotions which was fought in Herder's own soul during the writing of this early diary and beyond it during his whole life. The editor writes:

We see before us a man struggling at once to escape from himself and to be himself; struggling like his country, for complete and settled self-expression, in word and life. He is in the toils of a problem that only time and experience can solve. Like a hero of Schiller's, he is the creature of circumstances he has himself created, he cannot cast off their effects or detach himself from their memory. His only course is to build in solitude upon their positive contribution to his growth and learn the lessons that failure has taught him. We know that the success with which Herder did so was imperfect. His piercing self-analysis did not completely help him to change his life.

With all his compassionate admiration for the author Mr. Gillies never abandons a well balanced critical sense, which many Herder scholars are apt to lose. We are looking forward to his edition of

Wackenroder's *Herzensergießungen*, which is so much needed by students of Romanticism. (A note to p. 124. Bassewitz' translation of the *London Merchant* was first published in 1751; See M. L. Price, *GEGP* XLIII, 3, 354)

ERNST FEISE

---

*Wordsworthian and Other Studies*. By ERNEST DE SELINCOURT. Oxford Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford University Press], 1947. Pp. viii + 206. 12/6 [\$3.50]. In this volume Miss Helen Darbishire reprints eight meaty essays by the late Professor De Selincourt. Two of these are outstanding: that which deals with the young Wordsworth as revealed in his previously unpublished and unpromising juvenilia and that which gives for the first time the original form of Coleridge's "Dejection" and tells the circumstances of its composition. The others are "Wordsworth and his Daughter's Marriage," Landor's Prose," "Byron," "Walt Whitman," "The Interplay of Literature and Science," and "The Art of Conversation." The fifty-page introduction to the edition of Keats (1905), which (unlike most of the essays included) has long been out of print, is omitted; presumably it did not meet the austere standards of the mature scholar. What is here given us is at once enthusiastic and idealistic, solid and sane. It is confined chiefly to the nineteenth century, within which it reveals wide sympathies. It tends to ignore the faults and limitations of the author considered and to deal with the subject matter and personalities rather than with the *art* of literature; yet it discloses a keen, genuine, and soundly-based delight in that art.

R. D. H.

---

*William Crary Brownell, Literary Adviser*. A Monograph. By ME TSUNG KAUNG TANG. Philadelphia, 1946. Pp. viii + 93. Despite the title, only two or three pages concern Brownell as literary adviser. The study is composed, in fact, of a sketch of Brownell's life, a characterization of each of his works, and a concluding view of his personality. It is developed without any sufficient focus or end. Much of the space is occupied, in a fashion common in doctoral dissertations, by strings of inset quotations—raw silk rather than finished fabric. Of the candidate's own writing, the best that can be said is that it is creditable enough for one who has been in the United States only five years. It must be admitted that this dissertation should not have been published. A good book on Brownell is still needed.

NORMAN FOERSTER

Chapel Hill, N. C.

*Poems*, by RICHARD LEIGH (1675). Edited by HUGH MACDONALD. Oxford: Blackwell, 1947. Pp. xvi + 80. 7/6. This reprint of the verses of Dryden's "Fastidious Brisk of Oxford" is an interesting addition to the library of seventeenth century poets. Leigh had at best a mediocre talent—his father's *Critica Sacra* is to my tastes a more important work than the *Poems*—but he is a clear-cut specimen of poet-come-late. The influences are Donne, Cowley, and the rest (there is even an "Against Fruition"), but the vogue had passed. One will like Leigh best in his attempts to catch the scientific spirit, in "Magnificence under Ground," "Greatness in Little," "Light," "Air," and "The Revolutions of Fate", but he could not succeed where Cowley failed.

D. C. A.

---

*The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More*. Edited by ELIZABETH FRANCES ROGERS. Princeton Univ. Press, 1947. Pp. xxii + 584. Five plates. \$7.50. Though of greatest interest to historians, this superbly edited volume will please students of early Tudor Literature and all those others who have been charmed by the amiable character of the great Chancellor. The model of Professor Rogers is the great edition of Erasmus' epistles prepared by Allen, and her edition complements her pattern for she does not reprint letters contained in that collection. A great many of the letters will be familiar to scholars; but when one reads through the whole collection, from the letter to Holt in 1501 to the letter to Margaret from the Tower in 1535, a fuller portrait emerges, one that the biographers, try as they will, cannot paint for us.

D. C. A.

---

*The International Who's Who*. Twelfth Edition. London: Europa Publications, 39 Bedford Square. Pp. viii + 1032 (double columns). \$16.00. In this post-war world of ours it is extremely difficult to get detailed information about many important contemporaries who are not listed in *Who's Who* or in *Who's Who in America*, unless we turn to *The International Who's Who*, the twelfth edition of which went on sale early this year. To realize that it is true to its title, one has only to examine the first page, which is concerned with a Danish diplomat, a Dutch jurist, a Finnish sculptor, an Estonian philologist, a Russian mining expert, a Canadian lawyer, an Iraqi politician, and three Americans, one of them born in Italy. There are about twelve thousand brief notices, giving under a person's name the date of his birth, his present address, the most important posts he has held, books he has written, etc. The editor admits that names are lacking

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume LXIII

MAY, 1948

Number 5

---

## JOACHIM MEIER'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE GERMAN LANGUAGE

Joachim Meier, born in 1661 at Perleberg, studied at Marburg, was the tutor of two young gentlemen on their tour through France and Germany, and then became a professor in the Gymnasium at Göttingen, and later, its director. In addition to the *Singspiel Die siegende Großmuth*, he wrote a number of *Romane*, now forgotten and rarely met with. One of these, the *Amazonische Smyrna*,<sup>1</sup> is of interest from the linguistic point of view, as Meier uses numerous words that are either unrecorded or else antedate considerably the examples given in *DWb* of the Grimms. In the following list an asterisk indicates that the word in question is not recorded at all in the *DWb*.

ABENDDÄMMERUNG, f.: gerieth ich in der Abend-*Demmerung* in dieser Gegend (161); weil sie bey der Abend *Demmerung* den *Pelops* . . . von ferne sahen (458) · *DWb* has no example.

ABERWITZIG, adj.: Wirkung einer aberwitzigen Thorheit und Raserey gewesen (810) : *DWb* has no example

ABSCHIFFEN, v.: Als wir jenesmahls von *Adrastea* . . . abschiffeten (579) *DWb* has no example.

ABSENDUNG, f daß die Absendung des *Lychas* nur allein zu dem Ende geschehen (984) *DWb* has no example.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Die Amazonische Smyrna Worinnen Unter Einfuhrung Trojanischer/ Griechischer/ Amazonischer und Asiatischer Geschichten/ Die Begebenheiten jeziger Zeiten/ und deren Verandrunen und Kriegs-Lauffte/ auf eine sehr curiose Weise/ in einem Añehmlichen Staats- und Laebes-Roman verwickelt vorgestellt worden/ Von Imperiali. Franckfurt und Leipzig/ Bey Michael Andreas Fuhrmann/ 1705.* Title in red and black. Frontispiece, 7 unnn. leaves, 1030 pp., 16 cm. As Goedeke (III, 260, 53.3) gives the nom-de-plume as *IMPeriah*, I may state that my copy has *Imperial*.

\***ALLEREDELMUTIGST**, adj. halte ich sie vielmehr vor eine der alleredelmütigsten die er jemals begangen (750).

\***ALLEREMPFINDLICHST**, adj. indem sie die allerempfindlichste Reizungen dem *Bellerophon* zeigte (948).

\***ALLERERSCHRECKLICHST**, adj. daß ihn der Himmel in denen allererschrecklichsten Gefahren erhalten (685).

\***ALLERGRIMMIGST**, adj.: Es war dieses gewißlich das allgrimigste Gefecht (644).

\***ALLERVERZWEIFELTEST**, adj. wurde sie die allerverzweifeltsten Klagen angehoret (502).

\***ALLERVOLLKOMMENEST**, adj. daß meine Liebe . . die allervollkommeneste, treueste und ehrerbietigste sey (682).

\***ALLERWILDEST**, adj. auch die allerwildeste Herzen zum Mitleyden zubeugen (21)

\***AMAZONIEN**, n. nicht allein mit mir nach *Amazonien* zugehen (412); sezete man die Farth nach *Amazonien* beständig fort (413), samt dem *Hippolytus* seinem Sohn nach *Amazonien* zuschiffen (619), Dieser in *Amazonen* so hoch beliebte Name (633)

\***AMAZONIN**, f.: Ich war eben diejenige Amazoninn (619), Es hatte eine *Amazonn* . . einen gewaltigen Streich auf den König zugemessen (628).

\***AMAZONISCH**, adj. des hochverlangten Weiber-Regiments, und anmutig gemachten *Amazonischen* Lebens (307); einen Abscheu vor das *Amazonische* Leben (620), diese *Cyme* eine Zerstorerinn der *Amazonischen* Sitten (633).

**ANBRECHUNG**, f. biß zu Anbrechung des Tages . . verstekkete (1021): *DWb* cites a single instance, from *Opitz*.

\***ANGSTBEZUGUNG**, f. forschete mit grosser Angstbezeugung, ob sie auch einigen Schaden bekommen (869)

\***ANGSTGETON**, n. Der Waffen Angstgethon, der wilden Krieger schreyen (929).

**ANGSTIGLICH**, adj. wie ängstiglich der Prinz bemuhet war, das Verlohrne wiederzufinden (954). *DWb* cites a single instance, from *Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig* (1593).

**ANHÖRUNG**, f.. die Zeit in Anhörung derselben ubel verliehren wurden (777); theils in Anhörung der Schafer-Lieder . . beschäftigt waren (930) *DWb* cites *Wieland*

**ANLÄNDE**, f.: sahe man die Anlande bey *Adrastea* mit vielen *Trojanischen* Schifften erfüllet (468); die Volker abgezogen, und die Anlande von denen *Phoenicischen* Schifften frey (1019) *DWb* has no example.

\***ANMUTSSCHEIN**, m. Wie *Phyllis* holder Anmuthsschein/ Ihn in die Fesseln können zwingen (930).

\***ANSPRENGER**, m: wurde er dadurch so sehr wieder seine Ansprenger ergrimmet (40), weil unsern Ansprengern dadurch so sehr der Muth entfiel (41); Unsere Ansprengere, welche gleichfals nicht wusten (42);

denen, welche von denen Anspregern erschlagen . . . lagen (75); befraget, wer unsere unvermuthete Ansprenger waren (ib.).

\*ANSTIFTUNG, f. die *Argiver*, auf Anstiftung ihres Königes (321).

ANVERWANDTIN, f. deren Tochter und Anverwandtinnen bey denen Prinzessinnen wären (305), Dieses erregeten die Freundinnen und Anverwandtinnen (636); *WDb* cites Gellert

AUSFORDERUNG, f. konnte er solches mit dieser Ausforderung nicht vergleichen . ein Freund . sich zu dieser Ausforderung erkühnet hatte . . . beschloß er, auf diese Ausforderung zuerscheinen (695): *DWb* cites Klinger

\*AUSFORDERUNGSZETTEL, AUSFORDERUNGSZETTEL, m. schrieb einen Ausforderungs-Zettel an den *Bellerophonies* . . . sondern übergab dem *Lykas* den Ausforderungs-Zettel (708)

AUSHEBUNG, f. wozu der Eingang durch Aushebung ethlicher Steine sehr kunstlich in meiner Kammer war (1022) *DWb* has no example.

AUSLANDERIN, f.. einer Außlanderin gnadiges Gehör zu geben (f [3]v) *DWb* has no example.

AUSLIEFERUNG, f. welchem es nunmehr mit meiner Auslieferung kein Ernst war (1016) *DWb* has no example.

AUSSCHWEIFUNG, f.: *Aeolia* welche diese Außschweifungen ihrer Gedanken kluglich bemerkte (504): *DWb* cites Mascou (1726).

\*BARENHOLE, f. Sie machten sich also aus dieser Beerenhole . . . hervor (805).

\*BAUMNYMPHE, f. Er fing schon an, sie vor eine Wasser- oder Baumnymphe zuhalten (839).

BAUMRENDE, f. wurde ich . . . einer zusammengeslagenen Baumrinde . . . gewahr (121); so viele Zettel . . . von zarten Baumrinden zuschneiden (908) *DWb* has no example.

\*BEFREIUNGSBRIEF, m.: daß ich keinen Befreyungsbrief vor denen unglücklichen Zufällen habe (955)

BEGUNSTIGUNG, f.: sich unter Begünstigung der Nachtfinsterniß von ihnen abzustelen (333) · *DWb* has no example.

BEHERRSCHERN, f.: daß sie seine Beherscherinn und nicht seine Dienerinn seyn wird (490): *DWb* has no example.

BEINAME, m.. selbst den Beynamen *Tarawippus* erhielt (816): *DWb* has no example.

\*BELEIDIGERIN, f.: sich nur allein wieder ihre Beleydigerinnen zubeschutzen (485).

BEMITLEIDEN, v.: werde . . . unsere unglückliche Liebe bemitleyden (23); den Zustand seiner Wunden liebreich bemitleydete . . . diese Wunden, welche sie bemitleydet (445), daß ich sie aufs höchste bemitleyde (957): *DWb* has no example.

\*BEMITLEIDENSWÜRDIG, adj. Es war ein Bemitleydenswürdiger Zustand dieser Prinzen (487).

BESEGELN, v. wenn wir stark beseegelt waren, wir die Räuber bald einholen konnten (407) · *DWb* cites Pierot (1742)

BESTERMAßEN, adv. und bat ihn sich vor denselben bestermassen vorzusehen (725) · *DWb* cites a single instance from Ettner (1697).

\*BEWILLKOMMUNG, f. waren noch in einer anmutigen Bewillkomm- und Glukwunschung begriffen (1000).

\*BLITZFERTIG, adj. eilten sie mit blitzfertiger Schnelligkeit mit uns davon (666)

BRUDERMORD, m. seine Aussohnung wegen des Brudermordes in *Lycien* (966) · *DWb* cites Goethe

BRUDERMORDER, m. : den Todt . . . welchen er als ein Brudermorder . . . verdient (684) · *DWb* has no example.

BUNDESGENOSSE, m. die *Thracier* . . . welche der *Trojaner* Bundesgenossen waren (625) · *DWb* cites Goethe

\*CHIMARE, f. von dem vermeyntlichen Ungeheuer *Chymara*, wovon die Poeten uns so viel Chimeren vormachen (f. [6]v)

COUR MACHEN Sie ist eine Heldin, und ist es demnach nicht Wunder, daß sie ihre *Cour* einem solchen Helden machen wil (f. [3]a) · Schulz cites Philo (1722)

\*DAZWISCHENSTUNDE, f. : daß ich fast keine Zeit weiß, so mir einige froliche Dazwischenstunden vergönnet (955)

\*DERMALEINSTEN, adv. daß der *Myrina* Willen und Befehl sie mir nicht dermahleinsten raube (582)

DIESERWEGEN, adv. sie wurde die Prinzessinn dieserwegen nicht ubel ansehen (624) · *DWb* cites *Felsenburg* (1744).

DOUCEUR. weilen ich mich in denen *douceurs* der Liebe nicht gar zu lang aufhalte (f [7]a).

\*EHRBEZEIGUNG, f. die schlechte Ehrbezeugung der *Cyme* erwiesen, ubel empfinden wurde (621).

\*EHRBEZEUGUNG, f. überschüttete man dieselbe mit so grossem Ruhm, und vieler Ehrbezeugung (370); den Schein einer angenommenen Ehrbezeugung (469)

EHRERBIETIGKEIT, f. und der Ehrerbietigkeit und Pflicht vergesse (601), bey denen geringsten Leuten so tieffe Spuren der Ehrerbietigkeit hinterlassen (679) · *DWb* cites Kant

\*EHRFURCHTLICH, adj mit solcher Majestat und Ehrfurchtlichem Wesen vermischet (864).

\*EIDESVERGESSEN, adj.: hieß sie eine Gottlose und Eydesvergessene (780).

\*EINROLLIEREN, v. damit man mich nicht unter der *Rubric* der Paßquillanten mit ein-rollire (f [7]v) · cp English *enroll*

ENTKRÄFTUNG, f.: Es währete aber diese Entkräftung nicht lange (699) : *DWb* has no example.



ENTSCHLIESSUNG, f. daß des Königes Entschliessung mich bestürzt gemacht (688) *DWb* cites Hahn (1721).

\*ERROTUNG, f. erwiederte die Prinzessinn mit einiger Errothung (870).

\*ERSTAUNBAR, adj. welche so erstaunbare Proben ihres Heldenmuths sehen lassen (372)

FABELHAFT, adj. derjenigen Zeiten sey, welche noch zu denen Mythischen oder Fabelhaften gerechnet werden (f. [5]v): *DWb* has no example

FANGEISEN, n. Er stellte sich sobald mit seinem Fang-Eysen zwischen sie und den Eber, welcher aber mit seinem Russel das Eysen in die Hohe schlug (53) · *DWb* cites *Nord Robinson* (1749).

\*FILOUSCH, adj. *Griechen*, deren Handwerk in Kriegen zur Zeit sehr rauberisch und filousch aufsahe (f. [6]r).

FLACHLINGS, adv. weil auch so gar der Streich auf dem Haupte flachlings gefallen, und nur eine leichte Wunde verursacht hatte (650) · *DWb* cites only one instance from Stieler.

\*FLORISSANT, adj.. ein so *florissantes* Reich, welches vor kurzer Zeit das *Pfrygische* . . . unterdrucket (f. [6]r):.

\*FRAULEINRAUBER, m. der . . . sich unterstanden ein Fraulein Räuber zuwerden (587), die Vermählung mit einem leichtsinnigen Fraulein Rauber (630).

\*FREIHEITBEGIERIG, adj. ihre Weiber auch viel zukriegerisch und Freyheitbegierig waren (344).

\*FREUDENBEWEGUNG, f. Nachdem die ersten Freudenbewegungen voruber waren (1004).

\*FREUDENBEZEUGUNG, f. würde er mit grosser FreudenBezeugung darauf geantwortet haben (690)

\*FREUDENZURUFUNG, f. beehreten ihn mit unaufhorlichen Freudenzurufungen und Jubelgeschrey (747).

FREUNDSCHAFTSBEZEUGUNG, f. umarmeten einander mit ganz ungemeiner Freundschaftsbezeugung (601): *DWb* has no example.

\*FRIEDENSVORSCHLAG, m.: in solcher Noth wäre, daß sie Friedens-Vorschlage annehmen müste (640).

GARTENZIMMER, n. als sie ihn in eben demselben Garten-Zimmer sizen fand (758); Indem er nun vor ein lustiges Gartenzimmer vorbei gieng (764). *DWb* cites Goethe.

\*GEFAHRSETZUNG, f. die Schenkung der hundert Gefangenen nebst der Gefahrsezung seines Lebens (433).

GEFAHRTIN, f. hatte sich endlich fast von allen seinen Gefehrtinnen abgezogen (790): *DWb* cites Aler (1727).

\*GEGENOPFER, n.: würde ich davor ein solches Gegen-Opfer nicht annehmen können (933).

\*GEGENREDEN, v. Ich befurchte, gegenredete *Lysippe*, daß (511); diese *Philonoe*, gegenredete die Prinzessinn (689); gnädigste Prinzessinn, gegen-

redete *Alanthe* (792); Ihr schmeichelt mir vergeblich, *Kleomira*, gegenredete die Prinzessin (846), Ich bin so wenig geschikkt, gegenredete er (870); similarly 912, 933, 941.

\*GEMUTSÄNDERUNG, f. und weil ihre GemuthsÄnderung beständig waren (505).

\*GEMUTSFREUDIGKEIT, f.. niemand die Ursache dieser Gemuthsfreudigkeit errathen konnte (922).

GEMUTSKRANKHEIT, f. ungeacht seiner Leibes- und Gemuths-Krankheit (334) · *DWb* cites Aler (1727).

GEMUTSVERÄNDERUNG, f. und sich einer Gemuths-Veränderung von sie befurchtet (522) · *DWb* cites Moritz.

GESICHTSVERÄNDERUNG, f. erinnerte er sich auch dabey des *Jobates* . . . ungewöhnlichen Verfahrens und Gesichtsveränderung (547). *DWb* cites Fr. Schlegel.

GLÜCKESSTRAHL, m.: Helden hätte, unter dessen Glückesstral dieses wichtige Werk ausgeführet wurde (890).

GLÜCKSVERMEHRUNG, f. horeten mit ungemeiner Freude . . . des *Bellerophon*es Gluks-Vermehrung (709).

GNADENAUGE, f. Drum schaut auf unsre Pflicht mit Gnaden-Augen nieder (930).

GRÜBELICHT, adj: es eine hochstverdrießliche Sache ist, eine grubelichte Liebste zuhaben (144); lasset uns nicht zu unserer eigenen Schmerzen Vermehrung so grubelicht seyn (582).

GUNSTBEZEIGUNG, f.: der . . . geleistete Dienst, schiene alle Gunst-Bezeugungen zurechtfertigen (272).

GUNSTGEWOGENHEIT, f. Er nam sich aufs neue einer grossen Freundschaft und Gunstgewogenheit an (531); wie sehr er sich hiemit die Gunst-Gewogenheit dieser Leute . . . verbande (541).

GUTIGKEIT, f.: werdet ihr die Gutigkeit haben, mir vollen Unterricht von eurem Leben zugeben (280).

HELDENFAUST, f.: gesehen, waß seine Heldenfaust vor Wunder thut (836) · *DWb* cites Goethe.

HERUMSCHWARMEN, v. haben nunmehr eine geraume Zeit auf dem Meer herumgeschwermet (476); noch auf diesem unbeständigen Element mit seiner Beute herümschwermete (477): *DWb* cites *Felsenb.*

HERVORBRINGUNG, f. mit Hervorbringung dieser Worte einen Zwang angethan (395): *DWb* cites Kant

HINABROLLEN, v. durch die hinabgerollte Steine, Pfeil und Wurfspiesse das Leben verlohren (1014): *DWb* has no example.

HIRNWUT, f. daß hiebey eine Art der Hirnwuth wäre, welcher man . . . zu Hülfe kommen muste (950): *DWb* cites Brentano.

\*HOCHVERBUNDEN, adj.. je hohner er die ohnedem so hochverbundene Prinzen hielte (443).

HULFSVOLK, n. mit denen Hulfs-Völkern zu Schiffe gehen wolte (335); auch um einige HulfsVolker von dem *Tros* zuerlangen (920); dem *Jobates* mit einigen Hulfsvolkern beyzustehen (959); so bald die dem *Jobates* versprochene Hulfsvolker zusammengebracht (975). *DWb* cites Goethe.

JAGDBEDIENTER, m. mit der *Argwischen* Königin samt einigen Jagtbedienten (871): *DWb* has no example.

JUBELGESCHREY, n. mit unaufhörlichen Freudenzuruffungen und Jubelgeschrey (747); Dieser Schuß wurde mit einem grossen Jubelgeschrey und ungemeiner Verwunderung aufgenommen (855) *DWb* cites Frisch.

KRIEGSGEWITTER, n. dieses einbrechende Krieges-Gewitter von seinem Reich abzukehren (323). *DWb* cites Schiller.

KRONENSUCHTIG, adj. Gleichwie ich nicht Kronensuchtig bin, antwortete der Prinz (956) *DWb* cites *kronsuchtig* from *Hamlet*

\*LANDGEGEND, f.: auch die Landgegenden allenthalben umher (1012)

LANZENBRECHEN, n. Spiele und Lustrennen, Lanzenbrechen, Ringen, Wettlaufen (851); Er hatte sich nunmehr auch im Lanzenbrechen versucht (852); beschloß er solches im Lanzenbrechen wieder einzubringen (856) *DWb* cites Hederich.

\*LEBENSÄNDERUNG, f.: Bey aller dieser meiner Lebens-Änderung aber (502).

\*LEBENSEMPFINDLICHKEIT, f.: daß sie fast ohne Lebens-Empfindlichkeit zu Boden sturzte (784).

\*LEBENSERHALTER, m. ihn mein werthester Prinz und Lebens-Erhalter, zuvergnügen (17).

LEBENSERHALTUNG, f. daß . . mir meine Freyheit oder Lebenserhaltung solte zustatten kommen können (447): *DWb* has no example.

LEIBESBEWEGUNG, f. etwaß so angenehmes in ihrem Gang und ausserlichen Leibes-Bewegungen hat (39) *DWb* cites *Lit. Briefe*.

\*LEIBSCHUTZ, m. erwählete er die Tapffersten . . gleichsam zu seinem Leibschut (539).

\*LETZTVERSTRICHEN, adj. Dieses nun haben sie . . an diesem leztverstrichenen Tage bewerkstelliget (803).

LIEBESANGELEGENHEIT, f.: hielte sich damals, einiger Liebes-Angelegenheiten wegen bey *Argos* auf (32); *DWb* cites Gellert.

LIEBESERKLÄRUNG, f. wieder mit einer unziemlichen LiebesErklärung aufgezozen kam (968): *DWb* cites Hölty.

\*LIEBESFARBE, f. zeigte mit dieser Liebesfarbe deutlich genug an, (710).

\*LIEBESHANDLUNG, f.: oder sich mit ihnen in Liebeshandlungen einlassen solte (147).

\*LIEBESHOFFNUNG, f.: und sie selbst ihrer Liebes-Hoffnung verfehlen machen (915).

\*LIEBESMÄHRLEIN, n.: hat sich auch nit in lauter abgeschmackte Liebes-Mährlein verwickelt (f. [3]).

LIEBESPROBE, f.. waß bedarf man dergleichen Liebes-Proben? (139); alhie nur eigentlich von denen Liebesproben reden . . . noch die Liebes-Proben anders als Wirkungen der Klugheit betrachten (140), nach vielen empfangenen LiebesProben (689), weil es eine gar fremde Liebesprobe seyn wurde (912): *DWb* cites Brockes.

LIEBESROMAN, m in einem Annehmlichen Staats- und Liebes-Roman verwickelt (Title) *DWb* cites Schiller.

\*LIEBESUNSTERN, m. Er erzählte mir auch seinen Liebes Unstern (278).

\*LIEBESVERDIENST, m.: indem ich mir aus einer Sache einen Liebes-Verdienst mache (537).

\*LIEBESVERFOLGUNG, f daß er entweder der Königin fernere Liebesverfolgung . . . erregen wurde (939).

LIEBESVERSTANDNIS, n.. *Pero*, mit welcher er ein Liebes-Verständniß hat (259); wenn ich nicht ein heimliches Liebes-Verständniß mit ihr hatte (298); daß er mit der *Trojanischen* Prinzessin ein, Liebes-Verständniß haben mußte (710). *DWb* cites Gotter

\*LIEBESVERTRAUT, adj weil er überdem sein LiebesVertrauter war (1020).

\*LIEBESVERTRETERIN, f.: daß es also keiner Liebesvertreterin bey mir bedarf . . . meine Gemahlinn eine geschicktere Liebesvertreterinn des *Bellerophon* bey der Prinzessin . bedeuten konnte (909); daß die Königin . . . eine gefährliche Liebes-Vertreterinn bey der *Philonoe* ist (917).

\*LIEBESVORSPRECHERIN, f.. ist die *Argivische* Königin ihre Liebes-Vorspracherinn bey der *Philonoe* geworden? (883).

\*LOBAUSBREITUNG, f beschloß . . . ihre Erzählung mit vieler Lobaußbreitung des *Bellerophon* (671).

\*LOSWICKELN, v wiewol ich sie zum ofttern wieder darauf brachte, wickelte sie sich doch sehr listig wieder loß (271).

\*LUSTBOOT, n.: Ich fuhr in einem Lustboth am Gestade hin und her (1006); indem diese beyde Fahrzeuge gerade auf mein Lustboth zukamen (1007).

LUSTHUTTE, f.: nach geendigter Tafel, welche man in Lusthütten, so im Walde aufgerichtet, gehalten hatte (904): *DWb* cites only Stieler.

LUSTJAGD, f auf der vor die *Messenische* Gesandten angestellte Lustjacht (70); hatte *Jobates* eine Lustjagt in dem Walde bey Myra angestellt (864); wie solches auf der neulichsten Lustjacht sich schon . . . zu Tage gelegt hatte (884): *DWb* cites H. v. Kleist.

\*LUSTRENNEN, n.: allerhand Spiele und Lustrennen, Lanzenbrechen (851).

\*LUSTSTREIT, m.: so sahe man ihn nicht bey diesem Luststreit erscheinen (362).

LUSTWÄLDCHEN, n. brachte ihn in ein Lustwäldchen an den *Thermidoon* belegen (420).

\*MEERESSEITE, f. und entkam nach der Meeresseite, alwo er jederzeit einige Schiffe bereit hielte (615).

\*MITBUHLERIN, f. erkläre mich hiemit, nimmer eure Mitbuhlerin zu seyn (847).

\*MITGEFALLIGKEIT, f.: Alle meine Mitgefälligkeit die ich gegen der *Iphnoe* Kriegerische Gemuths-Neygung bezeige (273); zeigte er gleiche Mitgefälligkeit gegen diesen Fursten (887).

\*MITSTEUER, f. dem *Antenor* aber die *Kleopatra* zur Gemahlinn und das *Trojanische* Reich zur Mitsteuer gegeben (745)

\*MITTERNACHTZEIT, f. kamen wir zu *Adrastea* um die Mitternachtzeit wieder an (464)

\*MITWISERIN, f.: *Thida* welche ihrer Geheimnisse Mitwiserinn war (405); weil dieselbe als eine Mitwiserinn aller Geheimnisse . . . erfahren hatte (777); Leibdienerinn, welche aller ihrer Heimlichkeiten Mitwiserinn war (953)

MORDBEFEHL, m. kein Verbrechen, womit ich diesen Mordbefehl sollte verdient haben (682). *DWb* cites only Tieck

MYTHISCH, adj. Zeiten sey, welche noch zu denen Mythischen oder Fabelhaften gerechnet werden (f. [5]v): *DWb* cites Platen

\*NACHTFINSTERNISZ, f. ob er ihn bey der Nachtfinsterniß vor einen Geist . . . halten sollte (161); sich unter Begünstigung der Nachtfinsterniß von ihnen abzustelen (333).

NATUREIGENSCHAFT, f. Sie hatte aber seiner Natur-Eigenschaften wegen einen kleinen Widerwillen gegen ihm (356) *DWb* cites Herder.

NIEDERREISSUNG, f. strafften sie nicht weiter als mit Niederreissung ihrer Mauren (616): *DWb* cites only Maaler.

PFEILHAGEL, m. sich mit einem dicken Pfeil-Hagel begrüßet sahe (337). *DWb* cites Geibel.

\*PFERDELIEBE, f. verlorh . . . sein Leben, durch seine übermässige Pferdeliebe (821).

\*PRIESTERHAUBE, f.: bedeckte er sein Haupt mit einer Priesterhauben (935).

\*PRINZESSINNENRAUBER, m.: hatten diese beyde Prinzessinnen-Rauber einerley Vorhaben (465), Er nannte ihn einen Prinzessinnen-Rauber (559)

\*RAUBINSEL, f.: ihre Erbfeinde vollend zuvertilgen, und aus ihren Raub-Inseln zuvertreiben (414).

\*REICHsvermehrung, f.: Das Schwerdt . . . welches ich bißhero vor die Erhaltung und Reichs-Vermehrung geführt (683).

RENOMMIRT, adj.: von denen damals nicht sonderlich renommirten *Griechen* (f. [6]r): Weigand cites Nehring (1710).

ROMANIST, m.: Daß ich auch kein Talandrischer Romanist sey ([7]r): *DWb* cites text of 1734.

\*ROMANSRICHTER, m nicht unter die billiche *Censur* tugendhafter *Romans-Richter* gerathen wil ([7]r).

SCHAFERFLOTE, f mit ihren Schäferflothen und andern Instrumenten (928) · *DWb* cites Göcking.

SCHAFERLEBEN, n die edelsten Jungfrauen unter den Vorwand des Schafferlebens an sich zuziehen (199) *DWb* cites Hagedorn.

\*SCHIFFBEFEHLSHABER, m. durch die Aussage eines Schiff-Befehlshabers (1008).

SCHIFFSBEFEHLSHABER, m derjenige Schiffs-Befehlshaber, welcher . . die *Thüa* liebete (1011) · *DWb* cites Campe.

SCHIFFFUBE, m sich auch biß auf die allergeringste Schiffbuben erstreckete (1003) *DWb* cites only Frischlin

SCHIFFFHEER, n richtete er ein ziemliches Schiffheer, mit welchem er . . . ging (382) · *DWb* cites Stolberg.

\*SCHIFFKAMMER, f drang er mit unbeschreiblicher Tapferkeit nach besagter Schiffkammer durch (999).

SCHIFFSKAMMER, f. horete . . . Geschrey einiger Weibesperonen in der Schiffskammer (998); kam er mit blutigem Schwerdt zu mir in die Schiffskammer (1025) · *DWb* cites *Felsenburg*.

\*SCHIFFSGEMACH, n als *Ilus* wieder in das Schiffsgemach hereintratt (477)

SCHIFFSTRUMMER, pl : das Meer von so vielen Gutern, Schiffstrummern und Todten Leibern bedekket (310) : *DWb* cites J. Mosen (1863).

SCHLAFGESELLIN, f.. sondern dieselbe auch endlich zur Schlafgesellinn erwählen wollte (481) *DWb* cites only Plesse (1744).

\*SCHMERZENS-AUSDRUCKUNG, f erzählte er mir solches mit so grosser Schmerzens-Ausdrückung (759).

SCHMERZENSBEZEUGUNG, f.. nam *Bias* mit grossen Schmerzens-Bezeugungen Abschied (24); weichherzig uber diese SchmerzensBezeugung des *Bellerophon*tes (690); weil er mit grosser Schmerzens und Verzweifelungsbezeugung geantwortet (989).

\*SCHNELL-LAUFEND, adj.: fertigte alsobald eine von ihren schnelllaufenden *Amazonen* nach dem Haven (767): *DWb* cites *das Schnelllaufen* from Goethe.

\*SCHRECKART, f.. durch des *Glaukus* gewöhnliche Schreckart so rasend geworden . . . noch weit rasender als vorhin, welches ohne Zweifel seine Schreckart verursachte, womit er sie sonst wild gemacht (821).

SCHUTZENGE, m.: Er nannte den *Bellerophon*tes seinen Schuz-Engel (901): *DWb* cites Dentzler (1716).

\*SEEHUNDEFELL, n.. an Seehunde-fellen, womit seine Unterthanen . . . einen grossen Handel trieben (97): *DWb* cites *Seehundsfell*, from Campe.

\*SPIESZGESELLIN, f · ich ruffe . . . meine ehemalige tapfiere Spießgesellinnen zu Zeugen an (634); daß diese *Amazonen* ehemals meine Spießgesellin-

nen gewesen (750), begaben sich zuruck nach ihren Spießgesellinnen . . . Als aber diese ihre Spießgesellinnen ankamen (786).

\*SPRINGQUELLE, f. · fuhrte ihn . . . nach einer klaren . . . Springquelle (935).

\*STROMENWEIS, adv.· wie er . . . sein Bluth stromenweiß vor euch fliesen lassen (495).

\*VERBRECHBAR, adj: alle diese Begebenheiten machen mich bey der *Philonoe* nicht verbrechbar (536), urtheilen nun, ob die unschuldigste Prinzessinn verbrechbar, und ob deren Tugend Straffe verdienet (635).

VERERBFALLEN, v. · seinen Thron auf den Prinzen *Sandoch* seinen ältesten Sohn vererbfallte (380): *DWb* cites text of 1789

\*VERHALSTARRIGEN, v · sahe wol, daß *Iphanassa* ihn zuhassen verhalstarriget . . . war (333), welche in dem Vorhaben ein *Amazonisches* Reich anzurichten unendlich verhalstarriget war (479); daß ich euch noch in einem Vorhaben verhalstarriget sehe (511); den *Iobates* in seiner ungerechten Verfolgung verhalstarriget sahe (680); so gar verhalstarriget waren sie (723).

VERMÄHLUNGSFEST, n. · auf nichts mehr als Freuden und Vermahlungs Feste bedacht (1005) *DWb* cites Herder

\*VERMAHLUNGSZEREMONIE, f · nach den Tempel . . . woselbst die Vermahlungs Ceremonien vollendet werden sollten (469).

\*VERRATERSTUCKCHEN, n Der *Lycische* Feldherr, welcher auf Anstiften ein Verrather-Stukchen vorhatte (543).

\*VERSAMMLUNGSPLATZ, m.: daß auf den Versamlungsplaz bey *Tenedos* sich einige Schiffe . . . einfinden sollten (925).

\*ZEITVERFLIESSUNG, f. : Wiewol nach kurzer ZeitVerfliessung *Epheso* nebst ihren Leuten hieselbst anlangete (392); daß man den *Pelops* nach so langer Zeitverfliessung auf dem Meer suchen musse (477).

W. KURRELMEYER

## A SOURCE FOR RODERICK HUDSON

Critics have pointed out various literary influences on *Roderick Hudson*, Henry James's first successful novel. Balzac, Hawthorne, Turgenev, George Eliot, George Sand, Thackeray, and Henri Regnault are all said to have entered into James's conception of this early work.<sup>1</sup> But there is another author who had, I believe, a more

<sup>1</sup> See Kelley, *The Early Development of Henry James* (Urbana, 1930), pp. 187-89; Beach, *The Method of Henry James* (New Haven, 1918), pp. 42, 74-75; Matthiessen, "James and the Plastic Arts," *Kenyon Review*, v, 537 (Autumn, 1943); Cestre, "La France dans l'oeuvre de Henry James,"

direct influence on *Roderick Hudson* than any of these, and that is Alexandre Dumas fils, whose novel *L'Affaire Clémenceau*, *mémoire de l'accusé* Henry James reviewed for the *Nation*, Oct. 11, 1866,<sup>2</sup> eight years before he began *Roderick Hudson*. Although there are many differences, both in the story and the treatment, which make James's novel incontestably a better book, there are enough similarities in plot, characters, and ideas to indicate a direct relationship.

Unlike most of James's early criticism, the review of *L'Affaire Clémenceau* expresses enthusiasm and high praise. He sees Dumas as a writer who has at one stroke "affixed his name to the list of the greater French novelists." The book is "before all things, *serious*." It "thrills and interests the reader from beginning to end." He finds only one serious defect in the work: its ultimate effect is to depress the reader. But James admits that the critic is taking high ground when he considers this a fault. He concludes:

Since the taste of the age is for realism, all thanks for such realism as this. . . . Since radicalism in literature is the order of the day, let us welcome a radicalism so intelligent and so logical. In a season of careless and flippant writing, and of universal literary laxity, there are few sensations more wholesome than to read a work so long considered and so severely executed as the present. . . . Such writing is reading for men.<sup>3</sup>

Basic similarities of plot are readily apparent. *L'Affaire Clémenceau* is a memoir supposedly written by a man accused of murdering his wife, and it is intended to be a complete account of facts and motives for his counselor at law. Pierre Clémenceau, the prisoner, is the illegitimate son of a poor seamstress. When he is fourteen, a famous sculptor, Thomas Ritz, takes him as his pupil and treats him as a son. Just when his natural genius has been trained into a rare power, he meets Madame Dobronowska, a Polish adventuress, and her daughter Iza, a girl of extraordinary beauty. The mother is living off the promise of the girl's future, while they search for a suitor with sufficient money and position to satisfy their ambition. Clémenceau makes a sketch, then a bust, of Iza. After several weeks of happy friendship between the two young people, Iza's mother takes her away to continue their husband-hunting elsewhere. For three years Clémenceau's only contact with them is an occasional

*Revue Anglo-Américaine*, x, 11 (Oct., 1932); Pacey, "Henry James and his French Contemporaries," *American Literature*, xiii, 245 (Nov., 1941).

<sup>2</sup> Reprinted in *Notes and Reviews* (Cambridge, 1921), pp. 219-27.

<sup>3</sup> *Notes and Reviews*, p. 227.



letter. In the meantime, his fame grows until he is recognized as one of the leading sculptors of the day. But the Dobronowska's hunt does not go well, and finally Iza, horrified by her mother's proposals that she sacrifice her honor to a rich old man, writes Clémenceau, begging him to save her. He asks her to become his wife, and she gladly accepts. For a while they are very happy. Then one day he discovers that his wife has been having a series of lovers. He breaks with her immediately, fights a duel, and goes to Rome, where he tries to forget his sorrow in work. But he cannot work. His inspiration is dead. He remains whole days motionless before his clay, unable to do anything because his mind is preoccupied with Iza. Finally in despair he is thinking of suicide, when he hears that his wife has reappeared in Paris as the mistress of a foreign prince. Without any definite plan, he returns, and when she receives him with a shameless proposal, he kills her.

In *Roderick Hudson*, as well, a poor but talented youth meets a patron who enables him to become a sculptor. When he is beginning to achieve fame, he, too, meets the most beautiful girl in the world, whose awful mother devotes her life to exploiting her child's beauty. Roderick also makes a bust of the girl and falls hopelessly in love with her. The plots diverge when Christina's mother succeeds in capturing a prince whereas Iza's fails, but they come together again when the artist must face his disappointment at losing the girl he loves. Roderick, as Clémenceau, has lost his ability to create and each book contains a protracted account of the artist's sterility and despair following frustrated passion. Both books end with violence, although of a different kind, for while Clémenceau kills Iza, Roderick is himself killed.

The skeleton of the plot is much the same in the two novels, and even in details there are some parallels: Iza is illegitimate, although the fact is important in Dumas's book only because it shows the influence of heredity on her. Christina is also illegitimate, and in James's work the fact is very important, since it becomes the weapon used to force her to marry the prince. When Clémenceau sees Iza, she becomes for him a symbol of Woman, later of Beauty; for Roderick, Christina symbolizes Ideal Beauty. Clémenceau makes the bust of Iza with the understanding that he will not be paid and that the bust is to become the property of the mother and daughter. Roderick accepts the same conditions before he models Christina. Under the influence of passion, Clémenceau, like Roderick, tempo-

rarily produces sensualistic art, which he, like Roderick, considers degraded.

It is in the treatment of the three major characters that the most interesting similarities and differences are found. The two heroes are much alike. Both are handsome, poor, and fatherless; both are fortunate in finding a sympathetic patron to guide them at the beginning of their careers. Clémenceau's description of his own nature as "extrême en tout, et qui ne m'a jamais permis de prendre la moyenne de la vie, nature nerveuse enfin, qui commande, passionnée, emporte, abat celui qui l'a reçue, sans qu'il soit jamais capable de la guider"<sup>4</sup> applies equally well to Roderick. Both are unable to withstand emotional frustration, which renders them incapable of imaginative response and condemns them to inaction. There is only one striking difference in the portrayal of the two men: Clémenceau repeatedly boasts of his chastity and a large part of his anger comes from his sense of the irony of the contrast between himself and his wife. James wisely omitted this theme in his novel.

Madame Dobronowska and Mrs. Light, the two mothers who drag their daughters about Europe looking for the husbands that will make their fortunes, are much alike. They are both middle-aged, with faded traces of a once brilliant beauty. Both anticipate their future greatness with an assumed grand air. Both delight in exhibiting their daughters' beauty. James wrote in his review:

Madame Dobronowska is an adventuress more false and mercenary than the fancy can readily conceive . . . There is something equally pathetic and hideous in her jealous adoration of her child's beauty and her merely prudential vigilance "Have you seen her hands?" she asks of Clémenceau, when he comes with his sketch. "Yes" "Look at them by daylight." "She raised her daughter's hand and showed me its truly remarkable transparency by flattening it, so to speak, against the light; and then, taking it between her own, she kissed it with a sort of frenzy, crying, 'Tu es belle ça!' . . ."<sup>5</sup>

The tone of that passage suggests the scene in *Roderick Hudson* where Roderick is modelling Christina's bust and Mrs. Light gathers up her daughter's hair, letting it fall through her fingers with a significant smile at Rowland, the patron, whom she reminds of

<sup>4</sup> Dumas, *L'Affaire Clémenceau-mémoire de l'accusé* (Paris, 1866), pp. 116-17.

<sup>5</sup> *Notes and Reviews*, p. 223.

"an old slave-merchant, calling attention to the 'points' of a Circassian beauty. . . ." <sup>6</sup> She also points out Christina's small feet as one of her noteworthy assets. But Christina, unlike Iza, turns aside her mother's comments with irony.

For although the two young sculptors and the two mothers are much alike, the two most beautiful girls have very different personalities—in spite of very similar backgrounds. They are the products of the same education, designed in each case solely to prepare the girl to become the wife of a prince. In childhood, each is said to have played with the children of royal families, each has learned to speak three or four languages, each has been told repeatedly how beautiful she is. Because of her surpassing beauty, each has been offered a fortune by stage managers, but in each case the mother has refused to have the daughter trained for the theatre, believing that she can find a more brilliant future in the proper marriage. The life which the girls and their mothers lead is the same. Iza complains at one point:

Croyez-vous que la vie que je menais depuis plusieurs années fût dans mes goûts. Me montrer toujours en public, être regardée comme une bête curieuse, m'entendre dire que je suis belle, sans que cela me mène à rien, ce n'est pas bien amusant à la longue. Ma mère le voulait. Que de fois nous sommes allées au bal sans avoir dîné! Que de fois nous avons engagé nos objets les plus nécessaires pour m'acheter une toilette! Que de dettes, que d'ennuis, que de scènes avec des créanciers sur qui cette beauté qui devait m'attirer des millions n'exerçait pas le moindre empire! <sup>7</sup>

Except that Christina's beauty seems to have had more effect on the creditors—her mother says, "I've raised money on that girl's face"—<sup>8</sup> there is little difference.

But there is a difference in the reaction of the two girls. Iza accepts her mother's ideas, for the most part, without question, and makes them her own. Her heredity and education have brought out three weaknesses. immodesty, ingratitude, and sensuality. She craves admiration and is happy only when her beauty is worshipped. She has a beautiful body, but no mind or soul. She is both simpler and more corrupt than Christina. At the end she is condemned as a monster, depraved and vicious.

Christina is a victim, unhappy herself and in her effect upon

<sup>6</sup> *Atlantic Monthly*, xxxv, 518 (May, 1875).

<sup>7</sup> Dumas, *op. cit.*, pp. 161-62.

<sup>8</sup> *Atlantic Monthly*, xxxv, 657 (June, 1875).

others, but not at all vicious. She is one of James's most complex and interesting characters. Wilful and impulsive as Iza, she has the mind and soul which Iza lacks. She does not accept her mother's ideas—in fact she does not hesitate to call her mother a fool. She is equally harsh in judging herself as "a miserable medley of vanity and folly." Although she must submit to being dragged about Europe in search of a husband, she takes refuge in indifference and irony. She has become world-weary, defiant, moody—belonging half to the world and the devil, half above them. She would never be capable of living solely for gratification of the senses as Iza, and she is capable of sacrificing to an ideal. Ironically, generosity combines with pride and a flair for the dramatic to make her dangerous to Roderick even when she is trying to help him. At the end the feeling for her which the reader shares with Rowland is one of pity and sympathy and fascination. In the conception of her character, more than in anything else, James has improved on Dumas.

Besides the parallels in plot and character development, there are also similarities in ideas in the two novels. One important theory found in both relates to the kind of life that is best for the artist. Both Thomas Ritz and Rowland Mallet, who are wise guides and patrons for the young sculptors, express strong convictions that the artist is better if he can lead a quiet life and avoid emotional extremes. This theme is repeated several times in each novel,<sup>9</sup> and the resolution of the plots with both Clémenceau and Roderick losing their artistic powers under the stress of strong passion shows a practical application of the theory.

A second major idea which occurs in both books deals with heredity and the responsibility of the individual for his own actions. The belief that an individual is determined by his heredity and hence has no free will is basic to Dumas' novel. Clémenceau says that Iza, like himself, comes under the laws of heredity, only she doubly so, since she was born of two completely vicious persons.<sup>10</sup> Clémenceau believes that if God gave free will to anyone, it was only to Adam. Since Cain, no one has been free.

A partir de Cain, le libre arbitre disparaît. Cain n'est plus maître de tous ses actes; il subit son générateur. Le père a été coupable, le fils est

<sup>9</sup> See Dumas, *op. cit.*, pp. 95-97, 203; *Atlantic Monthly*, xxxv, 148; xxxvi, 68.

<sup>10</sup> Dumas, *op. cit.*, p. 166.

criminel, la transmission physiologique commence, le fatalité héréditaire s'impose et ne s'interrompt plus Tel père, tel fils,<sup>11</sup>

A French critic, Cestre, in discussing *Roderick Hudson*, speaks of the characters as inheriting their temperaments, and says that James was following closely the example of Balzac in adopting this method of genetic psychology.<sup>12</sup> However, a careful reading of James's book will show that James was not illustrating the laws of heredity at all, but rather denying their control over the individual, perhaps stimulated to this by reaction against the importance given these laws by Dumas. Although Roderick, like Clémenceau, insists that he is not a free agent and that it is beyond his power to control his will, Rowland criticizes this viewpoint and repeatedly asserts the freedom of the will. "The will," he says, "is destiny itself."<sup>13</sup> And Rowland, more than Roderick, is to be trusted as the author's spokesman.

James's one criticism of *L'Affaire Clémenceau* was that it was depressing. The important changes which he made in his own telling of a similar story tend to alleviate a depressing effect. The insistence on free will rather than determinism, of course, does so. Roderick seems to invite his own doom, which he might have avoided by an effort of will. The change in the character of the young girl from the frivolous immorality of Iza to the complex good-and-evil of Christina alters the tone of the book very much and requires the story to take a different turn. James says that Dumas' story "traces the process of the fatal domination acquired by a base and ignoble soul over a lofty and generous one."<sup>14</sup> That is a depressing theme. *Roderick Hudson* also traces the process of a fatal domination, but it is acquired accidentally by a noble soul over a weak-willed one. With the implication that Roderick should have overcome his weakness, the effect is not depressing. A third difference, that of point of view, makes it possible for James to criticize Roderick and expose his failings. Clémenceau tells his own story. There is no one to criticize him and he remains the undisputed hero, whose account justifies his deeds. Roderick, who closely resembles Clémenceau, is seen largely through Rowland's

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 145.

<sup>12</sup> Cestre, "La France dans l'œuvre de Henry James," *Revue Anglo-Américaine*, x, 11 (Oct., 1932).

<sup>13</sup> *Atlantic Monthly*, xxxv, 426 (April, 1875).

<sup>14</sup> *Notes and Reviews*, p. 225.

eyes, and Rowland is constantly judging his friend, with sympathy but with an awareness of his weaknesses. These three differences all tend to give an impression of human dignity and freedom which is lacking in Dumas' novel.

Because of these similarities of plot, character development, and prevailing ideas it seems clear that *L'Affaire Clémenceau* was an important influence on *Roderick Hudson*. Whether it was an unconscious influence, rising from that deep well into which the strong impression of 1866 had dropped, or whether it was a conscious influence it is impossible now to say. On Oct. 30, 1873, one year before he began *Roderick Hudson*, James reviewed a translation of *Faust* which had an introduction by Dumas. There he spoke of Dumas' pamphlets and dramas, not at all of his novel. In 1895 when he wrote an article on the death of Dumas, it was again to praise him as a master of dramatic form, without mentioning the novel. He had apparently forgotten the earlier impression and was unaware of how much he owed to *L'Affaire Clémenceau*.

VIOLA DUNBAR

Wayne University

### CHAUCER'S ROSEMOUNDE

On April 2nd, 1891, W. W. Skeat discovered in the Bodleian Library an unknown poem by Chaucer.<sup>1</sup> Two days later the discovery was reported to the literary and scholarly world in the *Athenæum* of April 4th, 1891 (p. 440), where Skeat printed the complete poem with manuscript and textual notes. On April 11th, two more textual notes appeared in the same journal (p. 472 f.), and on May 23rd, 1891 (p. 667), J. M. Hart of Cornell University added some further comment on the poem, which Skeat had inscribed "To Rosemounde." A facsimile of the MS page, accompanied by a diplomatic reprint of the text, was included in *Twelve Facsimiles of Old English Manuscripts*, published by Skeat in 1892,<sup>2</sup> and in 1894 the poem, now entitled "To Rosemounde. A Balade,"

<sup>1</sup> *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Oxford, 1894), i. 81.

<sup>2</sup> Prior to that, Skeat had also published a double leaflet entitled "A Poem by Chaucer"; see E. Hammond, *Chaucer, A Bibliographical Manual* (New York, 1908), p. 460.

appeared in Skeat's *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Vol. 1 (p. 389). It is the latter text, with its unnecessarily normalized spelling, that has become the archetype of all subsequent reprints.

There is one single MS of *Rosemounde*, which is written on a flyleaf at the end of Bodleian *MS Rawlinson Poet. 163*, fol. 114r; the rest of the MS, which dates from the late fifteenth century,<sup>3</sup> contains a copy of Chaucer's *Troilus*. According to Mr. R. W. Hunt, Keeper of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, who has been good enough to check for me some of Skeat's readings in *Twelve Facsimiles* (see below) against the Rawlinson MS, the *Rosemounde* facsimile is an excellent photograph, though a trifle darker than the original. It is therefore a relatively simple task to make a detailed comparison between Skeat's transcript and the original MS as a basis for a further study of the text itself.

Miss Hammond, who compared the *Athenæum* text with the MS facsimile, found two errors in it, *Tristram* for *Tristam* and *secunde* for *secunde* (l. 20).<sup>4</sup> In the facsimile transcript of 1892 the former appears as *tristam*, the latter, however, remaining as *secunde*. Conversely, the reading *iocunde* (l. 5) is erroneously rendered *iocounde* in the facsimile transcript but correctly in the MS notes to the *Athenæum* text. The spelling *beauté* used in the *Athenæum* and in *The Complete Works*, whence it was apparently taken over by Robinson as *beauté*, appears correctly without the accent in the facsimile text, which on the other hand has *s* instead of *f* in *Rosemounde* (l. 15).

The exact text of Bodleian *MS Rawlinson Poet. 163*, fol. 114r, is, therefore, as follows, expansion of abbreviations being indicated as usual by italics: <sup>5</sup>

1. Ma dame ye ben of Al beaute shryne  
As fer as cercled is the mapamonde  
ffor As the Crystall glorious ye shyne  
And lyke Ruby ben *your* chekys rounde
- 5 Therwyth ye ben so mery And so iocunde  
That At A Reuell whan that I se you dance  
It is An oynement vnto my wounde  
Thoght ye to me ne do no daliance

<sup>3</sup> W. W. Skeat, *Twelve Facsimiles of Old English Manuscripts* (Oxford, 1892), p. 36.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 460.

<sup>5</sup> No distinction has been made between *s* and *f*, nor has the crossed *ll* been reproduced in *Crystall* (3), *Reuell* (6) and *fynall* (11).

- 2       ffor thogh I wepe of teres ful A tyne  
 10 Yet may that wo myn herte nat confounde  
       Your semy voys That ye so fynall out twyne  
       Makyth my thought in ioi And blys habounde  
       So curtaysly I go wyth loue bounde  
       That to my self I sey in my penaunce  
 15 Suffyseth me to loue you Rosemounde  
       Thogh ye to me ne do no daliaunce  
 3       Nas neuer Pyk walwed in galauntyn  
       As I in loue Am walwed And I wounde  
       ffor whych ful ofte I of my self deuyne  
 20 That I Am trew tristam the secunde  
       My loue may not <be<sup>e</sup>> refreyde nor Affounde  
       I Brenne Ay in <an<sup>e</sup>> Amoureuse plesaunce  
       Do what you lyst I wyl your thral be founde  
       Thogh ye to me ne do no daliance

At the foot of the last stanza is written in a different, much larger hand *TREGENTIL* — *CHAUCER*, the two words being approximately two inches apart, scribbled upwards on the right are the unintelligible: *oðgod ol olord*. The colophon is identical with that at the end of the *Troilus* on fol. 113v, except for the fact that the latter has, between *Tregentyll* and *Chaucer*, the words, "heer endith the book of / Troylus and of Cresseyde." In the *Athenæum* Skeat suggested that *Tregentil* was the name of the scribe, and restated this opinion still more emphatically in *The Complete Works*.<sup>7</sup> This view is shared by Robinson, though it has been seriously questioned by other scholars, e. g., McCracken, who believes—and rightly so, I think—that by *Tregentil* the scribe probably wished to convey a compliment to the poet, an appellative comparable to German *Hochwohlgeboren*,<sup>8</sup> in support of his theory McCracken quotes the following lines from Brit. Mus. *MS Sloane 1212*:

off my chambyr he is, and born in pallatye,  
*I-namyd tresgentyl Eger de Femenye.*

<sup>6</sup> Written above the line.

<sup>7</sup> P. 81, where in foot-note 2, Skeat writes "I do not think, as some have guessed, that 'Tregentil Chaucer' means 'Tres gentil Chaucer.' Those who think so had better look at the MS. I see no sense in it; nor do I know why *tres* should be spelt *tre*." That *tres* in the phrase *tresgentil* could have lost its *s* (or *z*) at that time, seems very likely, cf. K. Nyrop, *Grammaire historique de la langue française* (Copenhagen, 1899), I, § 465.

<sup>8</sup> *Athenæum* 1908, I, p. 258.



Brusendorff<sup>9</sup> accepted McCracken's interpretation of *Tregentil* but argued that the inscription was probably written later, about 1500, in imitation of the *Troilus* colophon and consequently had little value as evidence of the Chaucerian authorship of the balade. As usual, Brusendorff's argument does not carry much weight.

The MS has few errors, fewer, in fact, than Skeat assumed. He emended<sup>10</sup> *Thoght* (l. 8) to *thogh*, *semy* and *fynall* (l. 11) to *semly* and *small*, *trew* (l. 20) to *trewe*, and *be refreyde* (l. 21) to *refreyd be*; he also added an unnecessary *e* in *joye* (l. 12), a form taken over by Robinson and also by Kaluza,<sup>11</sup> who, besides, added an equally unnecessary *e* in *seye* (l. 14). The most convincing of these emendations is *small* for *fynall*, which is fully explained on p. 10 of *Twelve Facsimiles*: the error clearly arose "from misreading 'small' with long *s*, as *finall*, i. e. from confusing *f* with *f*, and *m* with *in*, after which *y* was written for *i*, because it was usual to employ *y* for *i* before *n*." Moreover, *trewe* is probably to be preferred to the MS form *trew*, which, if preserved, would result in a so-called Lydgate or broken-backed line; a headless line is a possibility, however, even though there does not seem to be any other line of that kind in the poem. For I agree with Skeat<sup>12</sup> that *dame* in the first line is probably to be read as a disyllable; we may compare *madame* in *Madame Pertelote, so have I blis* with *Madame, the sentence of this Latyn is* (NPT ll. 3158 and 3165), the former trisyllabic, the second disyllabic. On the other hand, I do not think that *thoght* is necessarily an error for *thogh*, for in the northern dialects in particular *thogh* frequently appears as *thoght* (NED).

A far more important case is the proposed *semly* for *semy*, which has been unhesitatingly accepted by subsequent editors of the poem, and quite naturally so, since it makes good sense. But although omissions of letters are common in early manuscripts,<sup>13</sup> we must not overlook the fact that there is incontrovertible evidence of an appropriate word *semy* and that consequently *semy* may well be what Chaucer actually wrote. In the fifteenth-century English-

<sup>9</sup> A. Brusendorff, *The Chaucer Tradition* (Copenhagen, 1925), p. 439 f.

<sup>10</sup> *Athenæum* 1891, I, 440, *Twelve Facsimiles*, p. 36.

<sup>11</sup> M. Kaluza, *Chaucer-Handbuch* (Leipzig, 1919), p. 19.

<sup>12</sup> *Athenæum* 1891, I, p. 440.

<sup>13</sup> *Twelve Facsimiles*, p. 10.

Latin glossary *Promptorium Parvulorum* (c. 1440) are the following interesting entries,<sup>14</sup> which would seem to supply the clue to the meaning of *semy* in Chaucer's *Rosemounde*:

CEMY, or sotyle *Subtilis*, -is, -le; omnis gen., 3 decl.

CEMELY: *Subtiliter*, adverbium

SEMY: *Subtilis*, -le; omnis gen., 3.

SEMLY *subtiliter*; adverb.

An obsolete meaning 'subtle' or 'subtile,' that is 'thin,' fits the context admirably, for *subtile* was formerly used of the voice in that sense, as appears from the following quotation from Trevisa (1398): *In subtyll voys the spyryte is not stronge* (NED).

NED says that *semy* is "of obscure origin," and that it may possibly be "an inference from some compound of *semi*-" This is not too plausible a suggestion in view of the fact that compounds of *semi*- are very rare before the sixteenth century and do not become really frequent until the nineteenth; Chaucer has the compound *semycope* (*GenProl* 262), whereas *semysoun* (*MillT* 3697) is a dubious case (see below). Moreover, the appearance of the adverb *semyly* in the *Promptorium Parvulorum* must imply that *semy* was a well-established adjective and not more or less a non-formation. Yet, if my derivation of *semy* is correct, NED is not far wrong, for *semy* is actually related to this learned prefix *semi*-, not directly but via a common ancestor, Latin *sēmis*, half, which has had many descendants in the Romance languages. Mistral<sup>15</sup> records the adj. *seme*, *emo*, *umo*, meaning "diminué, baissé ée; retraits, desséché, maigre, en parlant de châtaignes et des fruits à coquille dont la peau est vidée par défaut de maturité," and quotes such examples as "*arange seme*, orange desséchée; *nose semo*, noix maigre," etc. He connects the word with Romansh *sem(s)*, *scem*, *ema*, Catalan *sem*, Italian *scemo*, and Latin *semis*. Godefroy<sup>16</sup> has the verb *semer*, spelled variously *cemer*, *seimer*, *chesmer*, meaning "maigrir, dépérir," e. g. in: "Et plus le chevalier aima / Et plus son cuer en lui *cema*"; modern French has *se chêmer* "au sens de

<sup>14</sup> A. L. Mayhew, *The Promptorium Parvulorum* (London, 1908, EETS ES 112), cols 73 and 406; in the notes on p 695 occur the following variant spellings: *semy*, *semly*, *semyly*, *semely*

<sup>15</sup> F. Mistral, *Dictionnaire provençal-français* (Paris, 1932).

<sup>16</sup> F. Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française* (Paris, 1881-1902).

maigrir." For the latter verb Littré<sup>17</sup> cites the following Romance parallels: "provenç. *semar*, priver, *sem*, privé, anc. catal. *sem*, privé; ital. *scemare*, diminuer, amoindrir, *scemo*, anciennement *semo*, amoindri, piémontais, *semè*; bas-latin, *semus*, mutilé, *simare*, *semare*, mutiler; *sematio* et *scematio*, mutilation; du latin *semus*, demi." Gamillscheg<sup>18</sup> also connects *chêmer* with Italian *scemare* and Latin *semare*, to halve; there is, moreover, a French noun *seime*, sand-crack (on horse's hoof), which goes back to OFr \**seim*, corresponding to the above Provençal *sem*, Latin *sēmus* and vulgar Latin *sēmus*.

The *Promptorium Parvulorum* word *semy*, as well as Chaucer's *semy*, is undoubtedly related to the Provençal adj. *seme* and the OFr verb *semer*. Its suffixal *-y* points to an originally stressed vowel, namely the French past participle ending *-é*. Just as *asié* has given *easy* and *palé* the heraldic term *paly*, an OFr *semé* meaning 'diminished, attenuated' would regularly develop into ME *semy*, thin; since its *e* occurs in an open syllable, it was probably open (ê).<sup>19</sup>

This adjective *semy* may well be the first component of the alleged compound *semysoun* in *MilT* 3697. Skeat and Robinson print it *semy-soun* and *semysoun* respectively, translating it 'half-sound,' "i. e. suppressed sound" (Skeat), and NED, adducing the late Latin parallel *sēmisonus*, renders it "a slight or gentle sound." Manly-Rickert on the other hand print the line: *And softe he cougheth with a semy soun* (III, 150), giving *a mery* (Hk), *an easy* (N1), *a semly* (Ps, To) as variants of *a semy* (v, 366). It is not without significance, I think, that in none of the MSS reprinted by the Chaucer Society the term appears as a compound: Cp, Dd, El, Gg and Ha<sup>4</sup> have *semy soun*, Pw *semy soune*, Hg *semy soun*, and La *seme sowne*. In the same MSS, however, we find *semycope* (El, Hg), *semy-cope* (Cp, La), *semy cope* (Pw, Ha<sup>4</sup>), *semy Cope* (Dd), and *semeli kope* (Gg). We are therefore fully justified, it seems to me, in taking the hint from these MSS and interpreting *with a semy soun* as 'in a thin (suppressed, low) voice'

<sup>17</sup> E. Littré, *Dictionnaire de la langue française* (Paris, 1863)

<sup>18</sup> E. Gamillscheg, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der französischen Sprache* (Heidelberg, 1928).

<sup>19</sup> R. Jordan (rev. H. Ch. Matthes), *Handbuch der mittelenenglischen Grammatik* (Heidelberg, 1934), § 225.

—cf. *He . . . sayde to hem with sobre soun* (14th cent.), and *Yet þei answerid with dollefulle sone* (1420), quoted from NED, *sound* sb. 2, sense 4.

An emendation that is not only unnecessary but decidedly wrong is that of *be refreyde* (l. 21) to *refreyd be*, which even appears in NED and has been accepted by Robinson as the correct reading; Kaluza,<sup>20</sup> on the other hand, retains the original word-order with unsatisfactory metrical result: the third ictus must then fall on *re*-, which is never stressed in the other Chaucerian instances of the word.<sup>21</sup> If, however, we omit *be* and read *refreyde* (trisyllabic), we at once get a metrically perfect line. In that case *refreyde* becomes, of course, the infinitive of the intransitive verb *refreyde(n)*, to become or grow cold, which occurs twice in the *Troilus*: *Fro day to day he leet it nought refreyde* (II. 1343), and *God woot, refreyden may this hote fare* (v. 507). *Affounde*, which immediately follows, does not mean 'founder, perish' as suggested by Robinson and Kaluza on the authority of Skeat,<sup>22</sup> but it is to be derived from OFr *enfondre*, to be chilled or numbed with cold; *found* (vb 4), an aphetic form of this ME *affound*, is recorded from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in NED, where the *Rosemounde* word *affounde* is correctly quoted as an example of the corresponding full form of *found*.

That *be* was not in Chaucer's copy of the poem becomes immediately clear on an examination of the MS. Mr. R. W. Hunt of the Bodleian Library kindly informs me that this *be*, which is inserted above line 21, appears to be a later addition by another hand. The forms of the letters are different from the other examples in the poem; the ink is fainter, and the caret mark is different in form to that in line 22.

This insertion of *be* before *refreyde* can easily be accounted for. The late fifteenth-century or early sixteenth-century owner of *MS Rawlinson Poet. 163* obviously analyzed *refreyde* as the past participle of the transitive verb and thought that *be* had been accidentally omitted; perhaps he also felt that the metre would be improved by its presence in the line, for he can hardly have pronounced the final *e* in *refreyde*.

<sup>20</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>21</sup> *TC* II 1343, v. 507; *ParsT* 340-45.

<sup>22</sup> *The Complete Works*, I, p. 550.

The fact that Chaucer uses *refreyde* in *Troilus*, *The Parson's Tale* and *Rosemounde* and that it seems to be used by no other ME writer except Wyclif, is as good internal evidence as any of his authorship of the poem. Whether he or Wyclif should be credited with the introduction of the word into English, is first and foremost a problem of chronology. A comparative study of Wyclif's and Chaucer's Romance vocabularies might help solve this problem and perhaps at the same time shed some light on the relationship of the two writers.

The insertion of *an* above line 22 is a different case altogether. According to Mr. Hunt, the word is in the same hand and ink as the rest of the MS. The small mark easily taken for the final stroke of an *m* appears to be part of the caret mark in line 21. The problem confronting us here is whether this *an* above the line was originally in Chaucer's own copy or not. True, the line scans with *an* between *in* and *amoureuse*, though the second ictus falls on the insignificant word *in*, leaving the meaningful *ay* weakly stressed and immediately preceded by a heavily accented word. By omitting *an* and pronouncing *brenne* as a disyllable we obtain complete agreement between sentence stress and metrical stress. Since Chaucer was probably less afraid of the hiatus between an unstressed inflectional *e* and a following stressed vowel than his modern editors and metricists make him out to be, I am not particularly perturbed by the sequence *brennē ay*; compare, e. g., *Hyt fledde, and was fro me goon* (BD 396), *Algate, by sleyghtē or by violence* (FrT 1431), *Til that he haddē al the sighte yseyn* (CkT 4379), *And ye hym knewe as wel as do I* (CYT 602).<sup>23</sup> Furthermore, in Chaucer's usage *plesaunce* is very rarely preceded by the indefinite article; out of 103 instances of the word listed in the *Concordance*, only three, including the *Rosemounde* case, are so construed.<sup>24</sup> For this reason I am inclined to believe that *an* is the emendation by a scribe

<sup>23</sup> The hiatus can, of course, be avoided in all these cases by ignoring the meaningful stresses and analysing the first, third and fourth lines as headless; in the second line *algate* would then have to be trisyllabic, with the second ictus on *by*. Note also these two lines from the CYT: *That of the eyr myghte passe out nothyng* (767) and *Telle me the name of the prives stoon?* (1452), in which the admission of hiatus (*passe, name*) would facilitate sensible scanning.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *For to his herte it was a greet plesaunce* (ShT 1229) and *But to his herte it was ful greet plesance* (OUT 672).

who wished to make the line scan better; in his pronunciation *brenne* must have been monosyllabic. The error *fynall* for *small* would seem to indicate that the scribe of our MS did not stand on metrical niceties and that consequently *an* was already in the text he copied. The same copy no doubt had *trew*, just as it had *ioy* and *sey*; once the final *e* had ceased to be pronounced, there would have been no point in restoring it in *trewe*, for such a spelling would have been no metrical improvement whatever. And so we were left with a line that failed to scan properly, unless it was taken to be headless or broken-backed. But in Chaucer's own copy lines 21 and 22 probably appeared thus:

My loue may not refreyde nor affounde,  
I brenne ay in amoureuse plesaunce.

Finally we have the seemingly hypermetrical line 6, from which Kaluza omits *that* in *whan that*, apparently treating *reuell* as disyllabic. The syncopation of *e* in *-ell* will, of course, meet all the requirements of regular scanning without any textual emendation. Though *revel* is normally disyllabic in Chaucer (see, e. g., *ChT* 4397, 4402), a form *rev'l* is no more remarkable than *ev'l* in *BD* 239: *And yet me lyst ryght evel to pleye*; monosyllabic forms of *revel* and *evil*, that is, *rule* and *e'el*,<sup>25</sup> are also to be reckoned with in Chaucer's time.

HELGE KOKERITZ

Yale University

---

### THE DIET OF CHAUCER'S FRANKLIN

In the Franklin Chaucer has given us a man who in his sphere has attained to a degree of success as high as that reached by the Knight or by the Man of Law. He is not a young man. A white beard, a grown son, and long years of service in public life mark him as being a man well past fifty, an advanced age in Chaucer's time; but the fact that a person of his years is able to make the two-day pilgrimage to Canterbury and back would seem to suggest that he is still the possessor of a good physique. There are several other indications of health. He is sanguine of complexion,

<sup>25</sup> See my article "Shakespeare's *night-rule*" in *Language* 18, p. 41 ff.

mild in disposition, and, although at an age at which the body is frequently sensitive to its diet, still able to enjoy the simple pleasure of good food. This leads us to conclude that even with all his cellars, pens, fields, and fish ponds, the Franklin believes in and practices the virtues of temperance; we may imagine that he disciplines his own conduct with the same firmness and wisdom that he has shown in managing the affairs of his county.

It was with such a conception of the man's character in mind, I believe, that Chaucer included, almost parenthetically, two lines in his description of the Franklin. He might easily have left them out, and we should never have been the wiser; but he could not have done so without modifying the picture as we now have it. Having first told us that the Franklin's food was so plenteous

It snewed in his hous of mete and drynke,  
Of alle deyntees that men koude thynke.

(CT., Frag. 1, 345-6) <sup>1</sup>

he calmly added:

After the sondry sesons of the yeer,  
So chaunged he his mete and his soper.

(CT., Frag 1, 347-8)

Since Chaucer has already made it clear that the Franklin stored food from one season to another and that he stored an abundance of it, we find it difficult to believe that the Franklin changed his diet because he had to. It is equally difficult to believe that he made the change through reluctance to display his wealth before less fortunate neighbors; regardless of how temperate or sensible the Franklin may have been, his standard of living was certainly well above that of most of the other farmers in his county. Moreover, neither of these explanations seems at all satisfactory when we consider that he changed not only "mete" but "soper" as well; for drink, even in the Franklin's house, could be expected to remain essentially the same throughout all the seasons.

The key to the solution lies, I believe, in a passage from the *Secreta Secretorum*, a work popular in the fourteenth century and one which Chaucer must have known in some version. Regarding

<sup>1</sup> For quotations from Chaucer I have used *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. N. Robinson, Boston Houghton Mifflin Company, 1933.

the diet to be observed during each of the four seasons it recommends:

In veer, diet in tempure, In heruste, hote mettis and moisti, in wynty, gret diet hote and drye, In somer suttil diet, cold and moysty <sup>2</sup>

The author has told us previously that

Ot Kepe Helth of Body two thynges Bene Pryncipaly necessary The Fryste Is that a man vse mettis and drynkis couenables and accordynge to his nature or kynde and to his complexioun, as in tyme and in houre and in seyson and as atte his costome For as ypocras Sayth, "costiome is the seconde nature or kynde" The seconde thyng is, that a man hym Purge in due tyme of superfluytez and humours corruptes, and therfor he is to wyt that aftyr the niye humores, the complexion dyuersyn and varien; . . . <sup>3</sup>

The idea of regulating diet according to the seasons of the year, we see, was only a part of a somewhat more complicated regimen.

This principle, however, was no more original with the writer of the *Secreta Secretorum* than it was with Chaucer. Statements of it or reference to it may be found in the writings of Hippocrates,<sup>4</sup> Celsus,<sup>5</sup> and Macrobius,<sup>6</sup> and also in the *Regimen Sanitatis Salernitanum*,<sup>7</sup> a commentary on which was written by one of Chaucer's acknowledged literary creditors, Arnaldous de Villanova. Moreover, the idea continued to survive in Renaissance thought, as the works of Nash<sup>8</sup> and Elyot<sup>9</sup> will testify. John Russell in his *Boke of Nurture* gives us a "Fest for a Franklen," in which we are told to select our diet according to the season of the year.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *The Gouvernaunce of Prynces or Pryvete of Pryveteis*, trans. James Yonge, in *Three Prose Versions of the Secreta Secretorum*, ed. Robert Steele, EETS., No. 74, 1898, II, 238.

<sup>3</sup> *Idem*.

<sup>4</sup> Hippocrates, *Regimen*, ed. trans. W. H. S. Jones, in *Hippocrates* (Loeb Series), IV, 369-81, *passim*.

<sup>5</sup> Celsus, *De Medicina*, ed. trans. W. G. Spencer (Loeb Series), I, 67-69.

<sup>6</sup> Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, quoted in *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. R. B. McKerrow, London: Sidgwick & Jackson, Ltd., 1904, IV, 35-36.

<sup>7</sup> *The Schoole of Salerne*, ed. F. R. Packard and F. H. Garrison, New York: Paul B. Hoeber, 1920, p. 162.

<sup>8</sup> Thomas Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absurditie*, in *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, *cit. supra*, I, 41.

<sup>9</sup> Thomas Elyot, *The Castel of Helth*, New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, pp. 36b-37b, *passim*.

<sup>10</sup> In *Early English Meals and Manners*, ed. F. J. Furnivall, EETS., O.S., No. 32, 1868, p. 54.



Hippocrates in his detailed exposition of a desirable regimen taught that one must keep five factors in mind when planning a diet:

Those with physiques that are fleshy, soft, and red, find it beneficial to adopt a rather dry regimen for the greater part of the year. For the nature of those physiques is moist. Those that are lean and sinewy, whether ruddy or dark, should adopt a moister regimen for the greater part of the time, for the bodies of such are constitutionally dry. Young people also do well to adopt a softer and moister regimen, for this age is dry, and young bodies are firm. Older people should have a drier kind of diet, for bodies at this age are moist and soft and cold. So in fixing regimen pay attention to age, season, habit, land, and physique, and counteract the prevailing heat or cold. For in this way will the best health be enjoyed.<sup>11</sup>

Man is a complex machine subject to the varying influences of age, season, habit, land, and physique; and it is essential that in his diet he strive to counteract any adverse combination of these. In reply to those writers who would impose upon man a simple diet, Macrobius, at a much later date, wrote almost angrily:

Ex calido enim et frigido, de sicco et humido constamus. Cibus vero calidum fecit et humectus, sicca est aestas et calida, auctumnus siccus et frigidus, hiems humida pariter et frigida est. Sic et elementa, quæ sunt nostra principia, ex diversitatibus et ipsa constant et nos nutriunt . . . Cur ergo nos ad uniformem cibum redigis, cum nihil nec in nobis nec circa nos nec in his de quibus sumus uniforme sit?<sup>12</sup>

The *Regimen Sanitatis Salernitanum* in its approach to the problem is corrective rather than preventive, but it emphasizes the importance of maintaining a balance of the elements in one's constitution and urges a seasonal change of diet:

Temporibus veris modicum prandere juberis,  
Sed calor aestatis dapibus nocet immoderatis.  
Autumni fructu caveas, ne sint tibi luctus.  
De mensa sume quantum vis tempore brumæ.<sup>13</sup>

The author of the *Secreta Secretorum*, following closely the recommendations of Hippocrates, mentions all five of the important factors. He suggests corrective measures for those who lack an

<sup>11</sup> Hippocrates, *Regimen in Health*, ed. trans. Jones, *loc. cit.*, pp. 47-49.

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 35-36.

<sup>13</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 162.

even balance of humors, but he lays greatest stress upon the diet to be observed in health:

. . . a man sholde vse mettis accordynge to his complexioun, but whan the complexioun Passyth mesure, ther hit be-howyth to vse mettes *contraries* to remeue or brynge the complexcion to euenesse *and* mesure. And most be done easly, by litill and by litill, that the kynde ne be not y-greuyd, for the kynde hatyth Sudayn eschaunge. . . . But whan the humours Passyth ryght by diet discordeynet, or by kynde or tyme or of regioun, they sholde vse contrary dyetis to redresse the excesse and the sorfete. The colerike sholde vse colde diet and moisti, and the Fleumatik hote diet *and* dry. I-lyke maner dyersite of diet shold kepedyn be in the dyuersite of age, and of tyme and of region and of custumes. Anothyr manere of diet couenabill is to yonge men *and* anothyr to olde men; to yonge men gret diet and moisti, to olde men suttil diet and hote.<sup>14</sup>

We have already seen that the author of the *Secreta Secretorum* is quite explicit with regard to the regulation of diet according to habit, or custom, and according to the seasons of the year. He also adds a note concerning the effect of region.

In the region of the Northe, grete diete and hote; In the region of the South, suttil diete and temperate<sup>15</sup>.

Thus we have all five of the factors mentioned by Hippocrates: land, physique, age, season, and habit, and although Hippocrates never wrote in terms of humors or elements, both he and the author of the *Secreta Secretorum* have the same basic conception of the regimen necessary to preserve health. As the foregoing quotations indicate, the five factors do not work separately. The combination of elements in one factor may balance, or counteract, the combination in another factor; yet the combinations in several factors may be the same and serve merely to intensify each other. The proper diet for a particular man, therefore, may change from year to year, from season to season, or even from hour to hour if he happens to be travelling. The man who would avoid sickness must be vigilant to see that no factor or combination of factors becomes strong enough to affect him adversely; for the basis of good health is nothing more than a proper balance of the elements as they affect the body, and the means whereby such a desirable balance may be maintained is simply an intelligently regulated diet.

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 238.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 239.

Of this, we may believe, the Franklin was well aware. Three of the five factors mentioned by Hippocrates are personal: age, physique, and habit. And Chaucer, whether through accident or intention, has given us definite clues about each of them with regard to the Franklin. We know, first, that he is old; and Hippocrates has told us that old men are naturally moist, soft, and cold. We know also that his complexion is sanguine, a combination of the elements hot and moist, which, according to Hippocrates, makes him ruddy, soft, and somewhat inclined to fatness. Of his habits Chaucer tells us only that he likes a sop in wine at breakfast and that he insists upon having his sauce "poynaunt and sharp." He also says, however, that the Franklin's house is never without "bake mete," supplied presumably from the pens of fat partridges and the mews of bream and luce; and he notes briefly the superlative quality of his bread and ale and the quantity of wine in his cellar.

These details are perhaps more significant than they seem to be at a first reading. The Franklin's hot complexion tends to counteract the coldness of old age; but both his age and his complexion make him moist and soft. To preserve his health, therefore, he should have an abundance of firm, dry food; and this is precisely the kind of food Chaucer has prescribed for him. We observe, first, that both "fissh and flessch" are served baked in this man's household; the meat thus cooked, in addition to being dry, is, according to the Latin physician Celsus, easily digested and very healthful.<sup>16</sup> We note, too, that the fish in the Franklin's mews are especially well suited to his constitution. The bream, a kind of carp, and the luce, or pike, are both hard, firm, fresh-water fish; and their meat is much drier than that of fish which naturally live in standing water. The medical writers are unanimous in preferring fish from salt water to fish from fresh water, and fish that live in running water to those that live in muddy pools.<sup>17</sup> Finally, we note that Hippocrates believed almost all birds to have a drier meat than that of beasts; but of the birds, he said, the one with the driest flesh is the ringdove, and the bird with the next driest is the partridge.<sup>18</sup> Thomas Elyot, following Galen, also lists the partridge among those birds most easily digested and joins the other

<sup>16</sup> Celsus, *op. cit.*, II, 187-205.

<sup>17</sup> See Hippocrates, *Regimen*, *loc. cit.*, pp. 321-23; Celsus, *op. cit.*, p. 195; Borde, *op. cit.*, pp. 268-69.

<sup>18</sup> Hippocrates, *Regimen*, *loc. cit.*, pp. 319-21.

medical writers in warning against eating the moist, soft flesh of water-fowl.<sup>19</sup> It would seem, therefore, that Chaucer, although mentioning specifically only a few foods, has with great care selected those that his Franklin could eat without injuring his health.

But the Franklin "wel loved" his morning sop in wine; and we may ask ourselves whether this was not perhaps an undesirable dish for an elderly man. Wine, however, is naturally hot and dry;<sup>20</sup> and Thomas Elyot quotes Galen as especially recommending yellow wine for old people because of its heating, nourishing, and purgative properties.<sup>21</sup> The sop itself was nothing more than a piece of toasted bread soaked in wine which had been spiced with canella, mace, powdered ginger, and cloves.<sup>22</sup> But both toast and wine have good drying qualities, and spices, which serve as a mild stimulant, are also drying in their action.<sup>23</sup>

This is perhaps one reason why he insisted on having his sauce "poynaunt" as well as sharp. In a cook-book of the fifteenth century we find a recipe for the kind of sauce that the Franklin probably ate. To make a *sauce vert* one should proceed as follows.

Take percel, myntes, diteyne, peletre, a foil or ij of costmarye, a cloue of garleke And take faire brede, and stepe it with vynegre and piper, and salt; and grynde al this to-gedre, and tempre it vp wip wynegre, or wip eisel, and serue it forþe.<sup>24</sup>

The sharpness in this sauce, we observe, is produced either by vinegar or by eisel, a wine made from vinegar. Both liquids are light, and both have the desirable property of consuming the moisture in the body.<sup>25</sup> Thus a sauce "poynaunt and sharp" is not merely a pleasant addition to the "bake mete" of which the Franklin was so fond but also a healthful one.

The Doctor of Physic would probably agree that the Franklin

<sup>19</sup> Elyot, *op. cit.*, pp. 20a-21a.

<sup>20</sup> Hippocrates, *Regimen*, *loc. cit.*, p. 325.

<sup>21</sup> Elyot, *op. cit.*, p. 32b.

<sup>22</sup> *Two Fifteenth Century Cookery-Books*, ed. Thomas Austin, EETS., O.S., No. 91, 1888, p. 90.

<sup>23</sup> See Hippocrates, *Regimen*, *loc. cit.*, pp. 329-33, *passim*; also *Regimen Sanitatis Salernitanum*, *loc. cit.*, pp. 169-72, *passim*.

<sup>24</sup> *Two Fifteenth Century Cookery-Books*, *loc. cit.*, p. 110.

<sup>25</sup> Hippocrates, *Regimen*, *loc. cit.*, pp. 327-29.

has taken satisfactory precautions to preserve the balance of elements which constitutes his natural endowment of good health. The Franklin keeps a supply of the food that is best for him, he has it prepared in the most healthful manner, and he has cultivated a taste for the highly desirable sharp and poignant seasoning. The details in Chaucer's picture are few, but not one of them is inconsistent with the portrait of a healthy man which he presents. Such consistency seems all the more remarkable when we consider that Chaucer might easily have told us that the Franklin ate roast goose or duck instead of partridge, or selected fish other than the firm, dry bream and luce for the Franklin's mews. It would not have seemed remarkable, however, to those of Chaucer's readers who knew something about the regimen necessary to preserve health. They would have noted with approval, we feel, that

After the sondry sesons of the year,  
So chaunged he his mete and his soper.

And they would have accepted this fact as a necessary part of the picture, a reasonable explanation of the old man's unusual vigor.

JOSEPH ALLEN BRYANT, JR.

*Vanderbilt University*

### ON THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HENGWRT'S CHANGE OF INK IN THE *MERCHANT'S TALE*

From E 2319 on, through the last hundred lines of the *Merchant's Tale*, the scribe of the Hengwrt MS (Hg) used an ink which has turned light and sharply contrasts with his customary dark ink used down to 2318 included. At the end of the same line 2318 the text breaks off in the three manuscripts constituting the genetic family which Manly has called group *c*, viz. Corpus Christi 198, Lansdowne 851, and Sloane 1686 (Cp, La, and S1<sup>2</sup>).<sup>1</sup> Mere coin-

<sup>1</sup> For a full description of Hg, see *The Text of the "Canterbury Tales,"* by John M. Manly and Edith Rickert (University of Chicago Press, 1940), I, 266-283, for group *c*, II, 62-63, 482; I, 95-96, for the chief points about both, see "Manly's Conception of the Early History of the *Canterbury Tales*," by Germaine Dempster, *PMLA*, LXI (1946), 379-415, esp. 392-395 and 399-400.

cidence, unlikely enough if we consider the length of the tale, 1174 lines, and the position of line 2318, not at any turn in the narrative but within a speech of Queen Proserpine, seems ruled out by the uniqueness of the conditions: Nowhere else does the Hengwrt MS show, in the text of any one piece, two distinguishable inks on the same page,<sup>2</sup> nowhere else does the *c* text break off within a piece.

If then there is a reason why Hg's change of ink occurs at 2319, that change must reflect a feature of the immediate antecedent of Hg<sup>3</sup> precisely at that point. Now, in all other instances in which the Hg MS shows a change of ink, Manly has found conclusive evidence that this was due to the scribe's difficulty in obtaining the texts of some pieces.<sup>4</sup> The almost inevitable inference is that, in the MeT exemplar used by the Hg scribe down to 2318, there was a break at that point. Yet it was, everything indicates,<sup>5</sup> from the same exemplar that he later copied 2319-2418. That exemplar, thus, was not incomplete; its break at 2318 was merely what, for lack of a better term, I shall call a case of disjunction, by which I mean that 2318 was the last line on a page or set of pages not attached to the page or set of pages which covered 2319 ff. Parenthetically it may be added that disjunction at 2318 in the antecedent of Hg, besides accounting for Hg's change of ink, also provides an explanation of the shift of affiliation of Ha<sup>4</sup>, genetically related to Hg throughout the central portions of the tale, but with *d*, in another genetic group, at least from 2322.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Or we might say that, leaving out of consideration the change of ink at F 721, which must be explained in an entirely different way (Manly and Rickert, I, 271-272), E 2319 is Hg's only change of ink within a *CT* piece — I have not seen the MS, but in view of the thoroughness of Manly's study of it and the importance of the different inks in his explanation, I feel certain that all observable changes of ink are recorded in I, 270-275

<sup>3</sup> That immediate antecedent of Hg's MeT must be imagined as a copy of that tale only, and as probably the sole intermediary between the original of MeT and Hg's text. In no *CT* piece does the internal structure of the Hg group suggest more than one such intermediary.

<sup>4</sup> Manly and Rickert, I, 270-275; II, 477-479

<sup>5</sup> Except for Ha<sup>4</sup> the MSS derived from  $\sqrt{\text{Hg}}$  before 2318, viz. Ad<sup>2</sup>, Bo<sup>2</sup>, Ch, remain in the same relation to Hg, and there is no perceptible change in the frequency or nature of their variants or of Hg's (I leave out of consideration Fi-Ra<sup>2</sup>, whose affiliations and shift at 2319 [Manly and Rickert, II, 282] seem to me uncertain.)

<sup>6</sup> Further, the most plausible explanation of the irregular quire 19 in

If we agree that the immediate ancestor of Hg was disjoined at 2318-2319, our problem becomes why this disjunction and the breaking off of the *c* text should occur at the same point.<sup>7</sup> Were the text of  $\sqrt{c}$  derivable from the antecedent of Hg or *vice versa*, the explanation would be obvious. But *c*, here as in most *CT* pieces, is a subgroup of the "Large Group," and Hg, as usual, belongs in another, definitely unrelated genetic group; i. e., the two have decidedly no common ancestor later than the original of all known copies; nor is there the slightest suggestion of contamination between them. Is it then in the very original of MeT that we must look for the root of the conditions in Hg and in the *c* manuscripts? The only feature whose presence there would provide the double explanation here required is again disjunction at 2318.<sup>8</sup> This would accord with everything that is known or can reasonably be assumed concerning the original of the MeT, viz., that it was a scribal copy,<sup>9</sup> written at a time when Chancer must have been contemplating at least some rephrasing and completing,<sup>10</sup> hence almost certainly intended from the first, like the originals of various other

Ha<sup>4</sup> (Manly and Rickert, I, 219) is that, when the scribe wrote E 2226 at the top of fol. iv of what he still planned as a quire of 8, he was in doubt as to the length of MeT (as he was, or had been about ML Endlink).

<sup>7</sup> Manly's failure to pursue the question is surprising. To quote his full comment. "Whether the change of ink in Hg at 2319 is a mere coincidence with the loss of text in  $\sqrt{c}$  or means that the Hg scribe stopped at 2318 because he had to find the continuation before finishing his copying, it is now impossible to say" (II, 282).

<sup>8</sup> Pure chance excluded, the only conceivable alternative to disjunction in the original would be that disjunction (or its effect, viz. absence of the preceding or following passage) was transmitted from  $\sqrt{Hg}$  to an ancestor of the *c* MSS or *vice versa*, along with the text of at least the passages immediately before or immediately after the disjunction. Then, in  $\sqrt{Hg}$  or in the antecedent of *c*, the text common to the two would have got lost, and the gap would either have been filled by means of an unrelated text or would have remained.—The chief objection to such an explanation is that it involves the use of the  $\sqrt{Hg}$  copy of MeT by the scribe of an antecedent of our *c* copies of MeT, or *vice versa*,—an improbable kind of contact since Hg and *c*, except for a remote relation in PsT, do not in a single *CT* piece share an ancestor later than the original.

<sup>9</sup> Note the nature of the errors present in the original at E 1824, 1998, 2127, 2133, 2230, 2240

<sup>10</sup> See Manly's conclusion about E 1305-1306 (III, 474), and note, especially near the end of the tale, the unusual frequency of lines hard to scan: E 1967, 2118, 2218, 2220, 2266, 2325-2326

*CT* pieces, as a working copy. Such a copy, prepared of course inexpensively, would doubtless be written without preliminary calculation of the number of pages required, thus, would almost certainly consist not of one solid quire but of separate parts (quires, or loose leaves, or both) of probably variable length. To fasten those parts together, or at least to fasten all of them into one whole, would in all likelihood not be considered necessary, and may indeed have been systematically avoided, for Chaucer would probably find small units more convenient to work on than large ones. In short, disjunction in an original such as that of MeT, even apart from the indication at 2318, seems definitely more likely than not.

But the main point of interest is not that the original of MeT was, to all appearances, disjoined at 2318, but rather the fact that, if this disjunction is to account for the conditions in Hg and in the *c* manuscripts, it must have been reproduced in at least two of the immediate derivatives of the original, viz. the ancestor of the "Large Group" and that of Hg and its associates Ha<sup>4</sup>, Ad<sup>3</sup>, etc.<sup>11</sup> Under what circumstances would such reproduction seem intelligible? It was Manly's conviction that most of our manuscripts of *CT*—Hg among them and, it would seem, also the "Large Group"—derived their texts of most *CT* pieces from copies made for friends of Chaucer's during his lifetime and with his approval. I believe that this theory lacks foundation<sup>12</sup> and is open to various objections, but, in the present article, confine myself to disjunction at 2318. Assuming that the head manuscripts which concern us here—the head of the Hg genetic group and that of the "Large Group"—were written with Chaucer's approval as preview copies for friends and patrons, would they not have been rather neat manu-

<sup>11</sup> Further transmission to derivatives of those two copies is possible but need not be assumed. Between the original and Hg there was probably only one intermediary; between the original and  $\sqrt{c}$  we must assume two, viz. the ancestor of the "Large Group" and  $\sqrt{bcd}$ ; the latter *may* have been disjoined at 2318 and have lost 2319 ff. before either  $\sqrt{b}$  or  $\sqrt{c}$  was derived ( $\sqrt{b}$  leaves the group at 2279 and jumps from 2279 to 2288), but it may equally well have never had those hundred lines. That the  $\sqrt{d}$  editor used, for 2319 ff., a text not belonging in the "Large Group" is one of several indications that the loss was old, at any rate older than  $\sqrt{c}$ ; yet cf. Manly, I, 95 and II, 281.

<sup>12</sup> For the evidence as I believe that Manly saw it, see pp 384-386 of my article mentioned above, n 1. On variants which Manly thought probably authorial, see J. Burke Severs, "Did Chaucer Revise the *Clerk's Tale*?" *Speculum*, XXI (1946), 295-302.



scripts, at any rate units rather than aggregates of loose parts? And would not the scribe of such gift copies, at work presumably in Chaucer's own house, have had on hand all portions of the MeT original? Why, under such circumstances, he should have duplicated in his own copy the disjoined condition of his exemplar, it is not easy to imagine. The alternative, in the form which the present writer has come to regard as most probable, is that the very great majority of the manuscripts postulated as heads of genetic groups for the various *CT* pieces were copies made after Chaucer's death from the papers that he had left; that several scribes worked simultaneously, transcribing from different portions of Chaucer's *Nachlass* and, very soon, also from each other's manuscripts; that those early copies were of single tales and of single blocks of tales, no arrangement for the whole collection or any large portion of it having as yet been worked out; finally, that they were intended, not for sale, not for readers, but as exemplars to be copied from when conditions would permit the preparation of *CT* manuscripts for readers. Those various points and the facts in their support will be discussed in later studies. All I wish to note here is that, on the presumption that such were the circumstances, one can see how some of the cases of disjunction of the originals would be duplicated in some of the early copies. The original of E 2319-2418 might fall into the hands of a scribe who had not as yet obtained the text of the preceding passages. If for any reason he felt that the opportunity should be seized, or, more simply, if no other still un-copied bit of the *Nachlass* was within his reach at the moment, he would transcribe 2319-2418, starting of course with 2319 at the top of a page, which page, later, might and might not get securely fastened to the pages covering the preceding passages. Again, if a scribe's copy of the tale down to 2318 was not in his hands the day the original of 2319-2418 became available to him, he might decide to copy that continuation starting with a fresh page.<sup>13</sup> What all this would denote—anxiety to secure the texts of as many pieces as possible, little or no concern for the outward appearance of the copies—, while difficult to reconcile with Dr. Manly's views, would agree very well with the alternative picture outlined a moment ago.

In closing we may ask whether, elsewhere in *CT*, conditions are found which likewise point to disjunction in the originals. As

<sup>13</sup> Cf. the experiences of the scribe or scribes of Ph<sup>8</sup> in connection with CYP (Manly and Rickert, I, 431).

"VENGEANCE AND PLEYN CORRECCIOUN,"

*KnT* 2461.

Writing in *PMLA*, 60 (1945), 307-24, Mr. Johnstone Parr presented certain arguments for dating Chaucer's final revision of the *Knight's Tale* at some date later than 1389, thus challenging Tatlock's generally accepted conclusions which would date it 1388-90. One of Mr. Parr's arguments has to do with the interpretation of the astronomical references in lines 2456-69, particularly lines 2461-2—

I do vengeance and pleyn correccioun  
Whil I dwelle in the signe of the leoun.

Here Chaucer refers to ills suffered by mankind while Saturn is in the sign of the Lion, in which position, according to medieval astrological theories, the planet's influence was particularly malignant. However, Mr. Parr believes that Chaucer's reference to Saturn's particular vengeance and the resultant "pleyn correccioun" are not supported by the writings of any astrological writers Chaucer might have known. His reference is not, that is, purely a conventional one. Mr. Parr assumes, therefore, that Chaucer was alluding to some particular events in current affairs which were attributed by his contemporaries or by him to the astral influence of the Lion. Mr. Parr cites records to show that Saturn entered this sign on 1 July, 1387, and left it shortly after 15 August, 1389. Between November, 1387, and the end of March, 1388, the planet was in retrograde, when its influence was believed to be especially malignant.

Reviewing briefly affairs in England during this period, Mr. Parr points out the events which might be considered instances of "vengeance" and "pleyn correccioun." Specifically, towards the end of 1386 young Richard's mismanagement of the government, his extravagance and capriciousness, so aroused the ire of his royal uncles, the dukes of Gloucester, York, and Lancaster, that they demanded that he dismiss his favorites and submit to a regency. Richard became virtually a prisoner, and Gloucester, as regent, began a course of judicial murder. During this period Chaucer suffered some reverses and many of his acquaintances lost their lives. The bloody deeds of the so-called "Merciless Parliament" and the

ascendancy of the Gloucester faction Mr. Parr would equate with Chaucer's use of the word "vengeance."

In 1389 Richard asserted his royal prerogatives and successfully enforced his demands. Members of the Gloucester faction in the government were forced to resign, John of Gaunt was recalled from Spain to keep his brothers and the other nobles under control, and Richard negotiated a three-years' truce with England's principal enemies, France, Scotland, and Castile. "Here," Mr. Parr writes, "was 'pleyn correccioun' indeed—coming just before Saturn passed from the sign of the Lion on August 15, 1389."<sup>1</sup>

It will be seen that Mr. Parr's argument, in relation to the passage in question, for dating the revisions of the *Knight's Tale* sometime after August, 1389, depends upon the proper interpretation of the line, "I do vengeance and pleyn correccioun." Such attributes are not properly applied to Saturn, Mr. Parr implies, the same Saturn who is responsible for "drownings, imprisonments, hangings, suffocations, popular complaints, poisonings, ruination of buildings, falling walls, cold infirmities, treasons, old commodities, pestilence."<sup>2</sup> Since Mr. Parr does not translate the line in question, it is impossible to tell just how he interprets the words, "do vengeance and pleyn correccioun," but his topical interpretation of the passage generally would indicate that he was reading the words in their modern signification; that is, as punishment inflicted in return for an injury or an offense (vengeance), or as the act of correcting (correccioun), they do seem to be peculiarly applied to a malignant planet.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *PMLA*, 60 (1945), 314.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 308.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Parr's use of the word vengeance and references to it elsewhere in his article indicate that he uses it in its modern sense. On p. 312, referring to Gloucester's activities and his forcing Parliament to vote him and his associates £20,000 for "their good services in delivering the kingdom," he writes. "It must have become evident to discerning persons then and there that the Gloucester faction was one of essential selfishness and hollow patriotism, and that Gloucester's behaviour in behalf of the realm was nothing less than diabolical political 'vengeance.'" On the same page (n. 22) he writes. "Curiously enough, one Chaucer critic, writing recently about the politics of Gloucester, uses the word itself. 'All the power which Derby exerted, and even the plea of Queen Anne on her knees at Gloucester's feet, failed to deter Gloucester's vengeance, and Burley went to the Scaffold in the Tower.'" Note also "malicious vengeance of the Gloucester faction" (p. 313); the Gloucester faction's "deadly vengeance" (p. 314).

But the line correctly translated fits the context perfectly and is in no way inappropriate. The *NED* lists as one meaning of the verb "do" the following: "To impart to, to bring upon (a person, etc.) some affecting quality or condition, to bestow, confer, inflict, to cause by one's actions (a person) to have (something)."<sup>4</sup> "Vengeance" merely means retributive or vindictive punishment,<sup>5</sup> and "correccioun" is used in the sense of corporal punishment.<sup>6</sup> "Pleyn" simply means full.<sup>7</sup> What, then, is Saturn saying in lines 2461-2 but that under his influence men are hanged, imprisoned, strangled, etc., reiterating lines 2457-60, summing up, as it were, activities legitimately ascribed to him?

To consider Mr. Parr's argument further, he would interpret "vengeance" as a reference to Gloucester's ascendancy and the bloody deeds of 1387. As a supporter of Richard II, it is not probable that Chaucer would have described Gloucester's usurpation as an act of "vengeance" in the sense Mr. Parr seems to imply. Many of his friends lost their lives and he himself lost his controllership.

Even more difficult to admit is Mr. Parr's interpretation of the "pleyn correccioun" effected by Saturn just before it passed out of the sign of the Lion in August, 1389. In May, when Richard asserted himself, there ensued briefly a period of comparative political calm both within his realm and abroad. Such "correccioun" is not in keeping with the planet's malignant influence, nor with Chaucer's use of the word itself.

WALTER E. WEESE

*New Haven, Conn.*

## "NETHER" AND "NEITHER" IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The *NED* lists "neither" as one of the forms taken by the word "nether" (as in "his nether lip") in the seventeenth century. Since no examples of the use of this form are offered, the authority

<sup>4</sup> *NED*, B4 under "do."

<sup>5</sup> *NED*, 2; cf. A *Knt* 2066; A *Mlt* 3506; B. *ML* 923; *Mel* 2625-30; 2645-50; *Parst* 890-95; *TC*, v, 1708.

<sup>6</sup> *NED*, 4, cf. D. *FrarT* 1320; 1, *Parst* 670-5.

<sup>7</sup> *NED*, 1.

for it is presumably very slight. Possibly the form is listed only because of its occurrence in the final line of K3<sup>v</sup> in the second quarto of Shakespeare's *Othello* (1630) where Emilia speaks of Lodovico's "neither lip" (Globe iv, iii, 40). A careful study, however, both of this quarto and of numerous different copies of the two earlier editions of the play, not only produces very positive evidence that "neither" *was not* an acceptable variant of "nether" in 1623, but also renders suspect the second quarto's testimony that "neither" *was* acceptable in 1630.

In the First Folio edition of Shakespeare the passage that contains the reference to Lodovico's nether lip is on page vv3 (p. 333 in the Tragedies, col. b, line 50) and hence in forme vv3:4<sup>v</sup>. This forme was subject to stop-press correction and exists in two states.<sup>1</sup> The earlier of these two states reads "neither lip" in the passage in question, but the later state has "nether lip." Thus the proof-reader who worked on forme vv3:4<sup>v</sup> of the First Folio obviously considered "neither" for "nether" a real error, for he required it to be corrected. And this fact has a definite bearing on the value of the evidence presented by the 1630 quarto (Q2). Q2 of *Othello*, once supposed to be derived from a more or less authoritative manuscript version of the play, was actually printed from a copy of the quarto of 1622 (Q1) that had been corrected and in some places very substantially augmented by passages taken from the longer Folio version (F).<sup>2</sup> The speech containing Emilia's remark about Lodovico's lip is a part of one of the augmentations: it has no counterpart in Q1. Hence Q2 is here based solely upon F—but apparently upon a copy of F that contained the uncorrected state of forme vv3:4<sup>v</sup>. Since numerous examples in the *NED* show that "nether" was certainly the usual seventeenth-century form of the word, it seems improbable in the extreme that Q2 would change *corrected* F's "nether" to "neither;" yet if

<sup>1</sup> The earlier or uncorrected state may be seen in the Lee facsimile of the Chatsworth-Devonshire copy (Oxford, 1902). It appears also in Folger copies 15, 31, 47, and 69; and 47 shows the proof-reader's actual corrections on page vv3. Photographs of this page in Folger copies 15, 31, and 47 (and also 10, which shows the corrected state) accompany my article, "A Proof-sheet in the First Folio of Shakespeare," *The Library*, Fourth Series, xxxiii (1942), 101-107.

<sup>2</sup> Although some of its omissions are obviously only accidental, Q1 represents a text that had been deliberately cut for dramatic purposes. It is about 160 lines shorter than both Q2 and F.

based upon *uncorrected* F the quarto might easily take over "neither" without change (as it took over other unusual spellings and some downright errors elsewhere). It therefore appears highly probable that the "neither lip" in the second quarto of *Othello* represents, not reliable evidence for the independent use of "neither" for "nether" in 1630, but only the somewhat careless reproduction in a derivative text of a form that in 1623 had been considered definitely wrong. The error mistakenly introduced into the Folio text was soon corrected—but not before the copy had been printed that was later to pass on its uncorrected "neither" to the second quarto edition.

CHARLTON HINMAN

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

CARDINAL PETRUS BERTRANDI, ZANOBI DA STRADA,  
AND PETRARCH

At the coronation of Charles IV, which took place on April 5, 1355, Pope Clement VI was represented by Cardinal Petrus Bertrandi de Columbario, who to fulfill this mission journeyed from Avignon to Rome and back again. He took with him, as chaplain and secretary, Johannes Porta of Annonay, who at the cardinal's direction wrote a complete report of the mission, including all the relevant documents and letters and a full, virtually day-by-day, account of the journey. This report bears the title *Liber de coronatione Karoli IV. imperatoris*. It is in two parts, entitled respectively *Relatio Johannis Porta* and *Itinerarium cardinalis auctore Iohanne Porta*. It has been published twice: first, imperfectly, by Höfler,<sup>1</sup> and then, in a critical edition, by Professor Richard Salomon,<sup>2</sup> who has also discussed it at length in a separate study.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Die Krönung K. Karls IV. nach Johannes dictus Porta de Avonniaco*, ed. by K. A. C. Höfler (in the series *Beiträge zur Geschichte Böhmens*, Abt. I, Bd. II), Prague, 1864.

<sup>2</sup> Johannes Porta de Annoniaco, *Liber de coronatione Karoli IV. imperatoris*, ed. by Richard Salomon (in the series *Scriptores rerum germanicarum in usum scholarum ex monumentis Germaniae historicis separatim editi*), Hannover and Leipzig, 1913.

<sup>3</sup> R. Salomon, "Johannes Porta de Annoniaco und sein Buch über die Krönung Kaiser Karls IV.," in *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, xxxviii (1913), 227-294.

I am very grateful to Professor Salomon, who is now at Kenyon College, for calling Porta's Zanobi and Petrarch passages to my attention.

## I

Chapter 59 of the *Relatio* tells of the arrival of the emperor in Pisa on May 6; Chapter 60 tells of the arrival of the cardinal in Pisa on May 12; and Chapters 61-68 tell of various events in Pisa in the period from May 18 to May 23. Chapter 69, entitled "Qualiter imperator laureavit poetam Cenobium," is as follows:

Die vero Dominica, *xxiiii* videlicet Maii, succedente, qua festum Penthecostes erat, dictus dominus cardinalis in ecclesia cathedrali Pisana missam solempnem pontificaliter et cum pallio celebravit, ubi dictus dominus imperator et imperatrix cum omnibus eorum pioceribus et prelati et Pisanus populus universus interfuerunt. Et missa finita continuo dictam ecclesiam exeuntes dictus dominus imperator super gradus marmoreos circumstringentes ecclesiam supradictam iuxta vas quoddam marmoreum super erectam ibi columpnam positum quendam poetam vocatum Zenobium de Florentia dicto domino cardinali ac ceteris aliis supradictis presentibus laureavit. Qui quidem poeta Zenobius orationem, quam conceperat se dicturum coram domino imperatore predicto, complere non potuit, sed oportuit eum esse principio dumtaxat et conclusione contentum. Sed dictus dominus cardinalis, qui libenti animo virtuosos honorat, illum secum in prandio tenuit. Et post sumptum cibum coram dicto domino cardinali multisque baronibus et prelati, qui etiam comederant cum eodem, orationem conceptam totam multum laudabiliter explicavit.<sup>4</sup>

The date commonly accepted for the coronation is May 14.<sup>5</sup> This is on the basis of the fact that in two manuscripts of Zanobi's coronation oration, *De fama*, the caption of the oration states that it was delivered *in mane adscensionis domini*, to which one manuscript adds *pridie idus maii*.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *Ed. cit* in n. 2, p. 112. In Höfler's text the numeral *xxiiii* is lacking. This chapter was quoted, from Höfler's text, by A. Hortis, in his *Studi sulle opere latine del Boccaccio*, Trieste, 1879, pp. 272-273, n. 4; and it was summarized, on the basis of Höfler's text, by G. Voigt, in his *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums*, 2d ed., Vol. 1, Berlin, 1880, p. 458 (in the Italian translation by D. Valbusa the summary appears in Vol. 1, Florence, 1888, p. 455).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Paola Guidotti, "Un amico del Petrarca e del Boccaccio. Zanobi da Strada, poeta laureato," in *Archivio storico italiano*, *LXXXVIII* (= Ser. VII, Vol. XIII, 1) (1930), 263-264.

<sup>6</sup> The two Mss. are Laur. *xo inf.* 14, in which the oration appears on ff.

In view of the eye-witness and chronologically meticulous character of Porta's *Liber*, and in view of the cardinal's particular interest in the coronation, the date of May 24, rather than May 14, is almost certainly correct. The date in the manuscripts may be due to a confusion of Ascension and Pentecost, or to an earlier plan as to the day of the coronation.

## II

Moving northward from Pisa, the cardinal stopped in Milan for two days, Saturday June 6 and Sunday June 7. The relevant entry in the *Itinerarium* is as follows:

Item die Sabbati sequenti, vi die Iunii, fuit in civitate Mediolanensi, et ibidem fuit die Dominico sequenti tota die.<sup>7</sup>

Chapter 73 of the *Relatio*, entitled "Qualiter dominus cardinalis est per quosdam comites in Mediolano honoratus et receptus," tells of the cardinal's leisurely journey from Sarzana to Milan, and continues:

Ubi duo dominorum Vicecomitum, videlicet Matheus et Galeaceus, se presentes inveniunt, dominus autem Barnabas apud Modociam permanebat. Dictus autem dominus Matheus visitat, enceniat et honorat dominum cardinalem, et dominus eum invitat et insimul convivantur, dominus vero Galeaceus semel dumtaxat eum visitans honoravit. Ibi dictus dominus cardinalis invenit virum unum non solum, de qua natus est, Florentie florem, verum et toto in terrarum orbe notabilem, ymo verius unicum singularem poetam, quo nullus maior natus umquam esse credatur, dominum scilicet Franciscum Petrarcam, iam diu est, per senatum et populum solempnissime laureatum in Urbe, ubi solum poetas huiusmodi

---

151 ff. (see A. M. Bandini, *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae*, Vol. III, Florence, 1776, cols. 735-736: this Ms. is of the 15th century), and University of Leipzig 1269 (which adds the words *pridie idus mai*), in which the oration appears on ff. 176 ff. (see Voigt, *l. c.* Voigt does not report the date of this Ms.). The oration appears also, but without indication of the date of its delivery, in Ms. 470 of the Palatine Library of Vienna—a miscellany containing several Renaissance items (see Michael Denis, *Codices manuscripti theologiae Bibliothecae Palatinae Vindobonensis*, Vol. I, Vienna, 1793, cols. 511-513: this reference is given somewhat inexactly by Hortis, *l. c.*).

<sup>7</sup> *Ed. cit.*, p. 140. As the preceding and following entries show, the cardinal had spent Friday the 5th in Lodi, on his way to Milan, and started west on Monday the 8th.



laureari fas est absque pape vel imperatoris presentia. Qui de omnibus et singulis Ytalie conditionibus, prerogativis et gratiis, quibus ultra ceteras mundi provincias est dotata, et de cunctis mundi climatibus dictum dominum cardinalem informat et tanquam devotissimus eius cum quanta potest reverentia eum honorat.<sup>8</sup>

This passage is of interest not only as affording a fixed point in the biography of Petrarch, and as giving further evidence of his fame, but also as reporting a conversation in which Petrarch developed his favorite theme of the "prerogatives" of Italy. One is reminded of an earlier occasion on which he had discussed the same theme with another French cardinal, Gui de Boulogne.<sup>9</sup>

### III

On Thursday June 25 the cardinal reached L'Isle-sur-Sorgue, a circumstance which leads Porta to write, in Chapter 74:

. . . ad castrum Insule comitatus Venesini, ubi singularissimus ille Sorgie fons, qui apud Vallem clausam Cavallicensis diocesis per unius leuce spatium prope supradictum castrum Insule sitam, cuius inhabitatio loci propter amenitates et prerogativas innumeras, quas in plerisque suis prosaicus quidem et intentis locis dictus poeta summus enumerat, est eidem acceptior, scaturizat, alveum ducit, gaudiose pervenit.<sup>10</sup>

This passage is noteworthy not only for its specific Petrarchan reference, but also as showing a continued local interest in Vaucluse. The valley had been a point for occasional excursions both before and during Petrarch's residence there.<sup>11</sup>

ERNEST H. WILKINS

*Harvard University*

---

<sup>8</sup> *Ed. cit.*, pp. 115-116.

<sup>9</sup> *Ep. sen.* VII 1

<sup>10</sup> *Ed. cit.*, p. 117. The subject of *est* is *inhabitatio*; the subject of *scaturizat* is *qui*; the subject of *ducit* is *fons*, and the subject of *pervenit* is the cardinal.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *Ep. met.* I 4 and III 3, and *Ep. sen.* x 2.

LA PORTA DEL PIACERE  
(*Paradiso* XI, 60)

St. Thomas uses the expression in his encomium of St. Francis. Francis came into the world, says Thomas, as a Sun (*tutto serafico in ardore*); and therefore whoever mentions his birthplace ought to speak of *Oriente* rather than *Ascesi*. Then, directly following this figure (kept in the word *orto*), he continues:

Non era ancor molto lontan da l'orto  
ch'el cominciò a far sentir la terra  
de la sua gran virtute alcun conforto;  
chè per tal donna giovinetto in guerra  
del padre corse, a cui (come a la morte)  
la porta del piacer nessun diserra.

Erich Auerbach, in a recent essay on this canto of *Paradiso* entitled *St. Francis of Assisi in Dante's Commedia*<sup>1</sup> comments on the verse (and verses) in question:

Shrilly, with the discord of the struggle against the father, with the hard rhyme-words *guerra* and *morte*, this celebration begins. And above all, the bride she is neither named nor described, but she is such that no one will open the gates of desire to her—as little as to death (*la morte*). It seems to me absolutely necessary to interpret the opening of the gates of desire in the proper sense as a sexual act, and thus *porta* as the gateway to the feminine body. The other explanation preferred by many commentators, that the reference is to the door of the house, which denies entrance to poverty or death, can indeed be supported by many passages from various texts where it is said that neither to knocking death nor to knocking poverty will anyone open the door: it does not, however, fit the bridal context, and it does not sufficiently explain *porta del piacere*, furthermore, Dante would certainly have avoided such a strongly obtrusive possibility of a sexual explanation if he had not expressly intended it: it corresponds perfectly to the concrete impression of the bitterly repulsive that he here evokes in general.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In *Italica*, XXII (1945), pp. 166-179, this being an English translation of the original essay in German which appeared in a small volume entitled *Neue Dantestudien*, Istanbul, 1944, pp. 72-90.

<sup>2</sup> *Italica*, loc. cit., p. 172. The original German (*loc. cit.*) reads as follows.

Schrill, mit einem Misston, dem Streit mit dem Vater, den harten Reimworten *guerra* und *morte* beginnt dieses Fest. Und vollends die Braut: sie wird nicht genannt und nicht beschrieben, aber sie ist so, dass ihr nie-

Auerbach's view of the meaning of *porta del piacere* is, I think, mistaken, and serves only to distort an otherwise suggestive and illuminating reading of this Canto. Nevertheless, one must admit that nowhere in the standard commentaries of the poem is there any interpretation of this figure which may adequately refute Auerbach's view. And one must likewise grant that if the metaphor is intended to suggest merely the door of a house, it does not seem especially appropriate in its particular context here. What then is this figure of a "door of pleasure," and from what native context does it arise?

The metaphor of a *porta del piacere*, it seems clear to me, is part of an established figure, an allegory of a kind, which represents, *dramatizes*, the assault of love from without. One of Dante's early sonnets is perhaps the best example of this figure.

Per quella via che la bellezza corre  
quando a svegliare Amor va ne la mente,  
passa Lisetta baldanzosamente,  
come colei che mi si crede torre.  
E quando è giunta a piè di quella torre  
che s'apre quando l'anima acconsente,  
odesi voce dir subitamente.  
"Volgiti, bella donna, e non ti porre;  
però che dentro un'altra donna siede,  
la qual di signoria chiese la verga  
tosto che giunse, e Amor gl'ile diede."  
Quando Lisetta accommiatar si vede  
da quella parte dove Amore alberga,  
tutta dipinta di vergogna riede.<sup>3</sup>

mand die Pforte der Lust öffnen will—ebenso wenig wie dem Tote (*la morte*) Es erscheint mir durchaus erforderlich, das Eröffnen der Pforte der Lust im eigentlichsten Sinne, als geschlechtlichen Vorgang zu verstehen, *porta* also als Tor des weiblichen Körpers. Die andere, von manchen Kommentatoren vorgezogene Erklärung, dass es sich um das Tor des Hauses desjenigen handelt, der der Armut oder dem Tode den Eintritt verweigert, lässt sich zwar durch manche Stellen aus verschiedenen Texten stützen, wo gesagt wird, dass dem anpoehenden Tod oder der anpoehenden Armut niemand öffnen will: sie passt aber nicht in den hochzeitlichen Zusammenhang, und erklärt nicht ausreichend *porta del piacere*, Dante hatte überdies die so stark sich aufdrängende Möglichkeit der geschlechtlichen Erklärung gewiss vermieden, wenn er sie nicht eben ausdrücklich beabsichtigt hatte. sie passt vollkommen zu dem konkreten Eindruck des Bitter-Abstossenden, den er hier überhaupt hervorrufen will.

<sup>3</sup> Rime cxvii, ed. Soc. Dant. It., 1921, p. 122. Cf. also Dante's *Tre donne intorno al cor mi son venute* for a similar version of the figure.

The "tower which opens when the soul consents" has, one may suppose, a "door." This door may be opened or not. And, outside, there is one (or something) seeking admission. For it is a fundamental tenet of the philosophy of love held by Dante, and by poets and theologians his contemporaries, that *love is offered to us from without*.<sup>4</sup> We are told as much in that all-important exposition of the way of Love which is made by Vergil at the very center of the whole *Comedy*.<sup>5</sup> In fact, that particular point is so clear to Dante from what Vergil there says that he words the matter just so in a further question addressed to his guide:

chè s'amore è di fuori a noi offerto,  
e l'animo non va con altro piede,  
se dritta o torta va, non è suo merto.

But to this, Vergil replies that there is, innate in man, a noble virtue called *libero arbitrio*:

innata v'è la virtù che consiglia  
e dell'assenso de' tener la soglia.

The *threshold* of consent: the figure of the door again.<sup>6</sup> And

<sup>4</sup> Christian love must always be so offered, if it is to include God's love for his creatures and complete that circular movement which begins and ends with God. See Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theol.* I-II, 26, 2 *Utrum amor sit passio*, ad Resp. "Nam appetitivus motus circulo agitur, . . . appetibile enim movet appetitum, faciens quodammodo in eo eius intentionem et appetitus tendit in appetibile realiter consequendum, ut sit ibi finis motus, ubi fuit principium." Cf. for that part of the process which is the awakening of love, the well-known sonnet in the *Vita Nuova* beginning *Amor e' l'cor gentil sono una cosa*; and, *passim*, the whole discussion of love in Cantos XVII and XVIII of *Purgatorio*. Not that one may presume to point such things out to a scholar as well-versed in the Middle Ages as Auerbach, who has given us a remarkable study touching on just this matter in his essay *Passio als Leidenschaft*, *PMLA* LVI (1941), pp. 1179-1196.

<sup>5</sup> *Purgatorio* XVII-XVIII.

<sup>6</sup> Other examples in Dante where the figure is latent are:

*Purg.* xv, 130-132:

Ciò che vedesti fu perchè non scuse  
d'aprir lo core a l'acque de la pace  
che da l'eterno fonte son diffuse

*Par.* III, 43-44:

La nostra carità non serra porte  
a giusta voglia.

now we see better what St Thomas meant about Poverty. She, like Death, is such a lady that every one of us guards against her the threshold of his consent. No one of us (*almost* no one of us) opens willingly the door (*porta del piacere*) to receive her into that place where she may rule over our life as only a truly beloved may—one, that is, except a certain young man of Assisi and he a Saint.<sup>7</sup>

CHARLES S. SINGLETON

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

### A JUDEO-PORTUGUESE PASSAGE IN THE *FARÇA DE INÊS PEREIRA* OF GIL VICENTE

Alça manim dona, ó dona, ha,  
 Arrea espeçulá,  
 Bento o Deu de Jacob,  
 Bento o Deu que a Pharaó  
 Espantou e espantará:  
 Bento o Deu de Abraham,  
 Benta a terra de Canaam.  
 Pera bem sejas casados  
 Dae-nos ca senhos ducados.<sup>1</sup>

In the most recent edition of the *Obras completas* of Gil Vicente, prepared by Marques Braga,<sup>2</sup> reference is made to the above lines characterizing them as "formulas de benção aos noivos." In this connection, Marques Braga is in accord with a former editor of Gil Vicente, Mendes dos Remédios, who, according to Braga, considers the first line as representing a distortion of the Hebrew liturgical terms *Elohim Adonai*.<sup>3</sup> It is the purpose of this article to offer a new interpretation of the passage given above.

<sup>7</sup> In the passage in question, the first husband of Lady Poverty is said to be Christ. She ascended the Cross with Him (v 64). And the *first* followers of Francis are said to take off their shoes and follow after the husband (Francis) so does the spouse (Poverty) please them.

<sup>1</sup> *Obras de Gil Vicente*, ed. Mendes dos Remédios, Coimbra, 1912, II, 336.

<sup>2</sup> *Obras completas de Gil Vicente*, ed. Marques Braga, Lisbon Sá da Costa 1943-44, VI, 252.

<sup>3</sup> This interpretation is not mentioned in the Mendes dos Remédios edition but appears, according to a footnote of Marques Braga, in *Conferências sobre os autos de Gil Vicente*, which unfortunately has been unavailable to the present writers.

The *Farça de Inês Pereira* introduces the *Judeus casamenteiros*, Latão and Vidal, who arrive on the scene shortly after Inês, the peasant girl who longs for a husband with courtly accomplishments, has dismissed her first suitor, a rustic like herself. When her mother asks how she expects to find the squire of whom she dreams, Inês replies that she has been talking with some marriage-brokers who are to return promptly. It is at this point that Latão and Vidal appear. They describe the difficulties of their search and the hardships they have undergone, mentioning as well two personages, Badajoz and Vilha Castim, whom they have consulted. Finally, Vidal declares that a squire with the proper qualifications has been found. There follows a dialogue between the squire, Bras de Mata, and his servant, after which they join the group already described. Bras asks Inês for her hand and is accepted by her after he has sung the romance, *Mal me queren en Castilla*. The wedding takes place immediately (without the presence of a priest) and the couple receive the blessing of Vidal reproduced above.

The words which present the greatest difficulty are the substantives *manim* and *espeçulá*, which seem to be unknown to both Spanish and Portuguese lexicographers, so that an effort to determine their meaning and to account for their phonetic development from better known forms is justified.

*Manim* appears to be the Spanish *mano* with the usual Hebrew masculine plural suffix *-im* (Cf. the Heb. dual *yādāyīm*=hands).<sup>4</sup> Spanish words in Judeo-Portuguese are attested in a text of the thirteenth century on the illumination of manuscripts.<sup>5</sup> Thus we see that Gil Vicente has combined in a single word two non-Portuguese tendencies in the language of the contemporary Jews.

Raising the hands must have been a gesture of thanksgiving, mingled with praise for the Deity; cf. the following passages of the *Cantar de Mio Gid* and the *Primera Crónica General* (cf. Menéndez Pidal in the dictionary of his edition of the *Cantar*, s. v. *alçar*):

<sup>4</sup> Such combinations of Spanish radical plus the Hebrew plural termination are found in modern Judeo-Spanish dialects. Ex. *ladrín*, *ladrunim*. Cf. Luria, Max A., *A Study of the Monastir Dialect of Judeo-Spanish*, New York, 1930, p. 137; Crews, Cynthia M., *Recherches sur le Judéo-Espagnol*, Paris, 1935, note 657, p. 225.

<sup>5</sup> Blondheim, David S., *Livro de como se fazem as cores*, Todd Memorial Volumes, I, New York, Columbia Univ. Press, 1930, pp. 77 (*sabana*) and 78 (*color preto e fermoso*).

alçan las manos pora Dios rogar.  
desta ganancia cómmo es buena e grand.

*Cantar de Mio Cid*, 1617-18.

algó las manos a Dios et dixo dos uezes  
loado sea a ti Sennor'

*Primera Crónica General*, 506 a 10

The lack of the definite article in the phrases *alça manim* and *arrea espequlá* may be considered one of the playwright's efforts to show the faulty speech of the Portuguese-speaking Jew.

*Espequlá* is to be considered a modification of *espressura*, which is common to both Hispanic languages with a general meaning of "thickness, density, dense growth" and with a more limited meaning (especially in Spanish) of "dense growth of hair or head of hair."<sup>6</sup> The phonetic changes to be accounted for are *l* instead of *r* and the shift of accent from penult to oxytone. The former represents a reverse rhotacism for which an exact parallel is difficult to find. Perhaps Gil Vicente had in mind cases such as those listed in Max Leopold Wagner, *Beitrage zur Kenntnis des Judentums von Konstantinopel*, pp 117-8, (*zarzamora* > *salsamora*, *el refrán* > *el lefrán*) where Judeo-Spanish appears to show hesitancy between *l* and *r*. Only one example of this type of rhotacism is mentioned in the incomplete glossary of the Moroccan dialect of Judeo-Spanish. *abrigo* > *abhgo*.<sup>7</sup> A parallel to the shift in accent can be found in this Hakitia dialect still current in Tangier, Tetuán and adjacent areas of Algeria (Oran). Benoliel has discovered numerous examples.

Las palabras esdrújulas en castellano quedan siendo agudas en Hakitia paxaró, fabricá, latigó, lampará, balsamó, tutaná, medicó, murciegaló, colerá.<sup>8</sup>

Similar forms have been recorded by Bénichou.<sup>9</sup>

*sabanás* (p 69, *El Sevillano*, I 30)

*lagrimás* (p. 116, *La Reina Xerifa mora*, I. 29)

*Malagá* (p. 339, *Melchior y Laurensia*, I 1)

<sup>6</sup> *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española*, 1914 ed, p 441

<sup>7</sup> Benoliel, José, *Dialectos judeo-hispano-marroquí o hakitia*, *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, XIV (1927), p. 556

<sup>8</sup> Benoliel, José, *op. cit.*, XIII (1926), 342.

<sup>9</sup> Bénichou, P., *Romances judeo-españoles de Marruecos*, *Revista de Filología Hispánica*, VI (1944), *passim*, and VII (1945), 216.

It may be objected that in all of the examples cited the original accent was preparoxytonic rather than paroxytonic as in *espressura*. Nevertheless, a general tendency to shift the accent to the final syllable is apparent to us as it must have been to Vicente when he distorted the original word to emphasize the Jewish flavor of the passage. It is more difficult to arrive at a valid explanation of the phenomenon. Perhaps there has been some influence by the system of accentuation in Sephardic Hebrew, where the ultimate is generally tonic.

The reader, with this interpretation and explanation of the key words *manim* and *espeçulá*, is enabled to visualize the scene. In the first line the marriage-broker Vidal commands Inês to raise her hands in sign of gratitude for the husband who has been provided through Vidal's good offices. From the sphere of traditional Hispanic-Christian custom, Vidal proceeds in the second line to introduce a specifically Jewish element. The phrase *arrea espeçulá* "arrange your hair" must refer to the requirement that Jewish matrons indicate their conjugal status by concealing their hair, either through its removal and replacement by a wig, or, especially in the case of the Sephardic Jews, through the use of a kerchief to achieve the same purpose (cf. *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. *wig* (*sheitel*)). Evidence that this custom has continued until modern times is offered by the following passages from an account of the Bensaúde family of the island of São Miguel of the Azores:

Procedia-se aos preparativos para o casamento, quando surgiu um incidente que veio pôr em perigo a sua realização: era costume por êsse tempo cortar o cabelo às raparigas judias, por ocasião do casamento, e substituí-lo por uma cabeleira postiça.

Essa vélha tradição caiu depois em Portugal quási completamente em desuso. Quando falaram à minha mãe em cortar o seu lindo cabelo, declarou muito resoluta que nesse caso preferia não casar. O avô teve de intervir novamente para remover a dificuldade, estabelecendo-se o seguinte compromisso: minha mãe conservaria o seu cabelo, mas ocultá-lo-ia durante a cerimónia do casamento com quaisquer adornos e depois faria o que quisesse.<sup>10</sup>

The benediction formulae which follow are a *mélange* of translated excerpts from the Hebrew liturgy, however, they are not

<sup>10</sup> Bensaúde, Alfredo, *Vida de José Bensaúde*, Privately printed, Oporto, 1936, p. 99.



particularly drawn from the marriage ceremony, and in one instance (*terra de Canaam*) expressed in terms strange to Jewish custom. The ordinary nuptial benediction makes allusion to Judea and Jerusalem, and in other references Palestine is generally called *the land of Israel, the land of our fathers, or Zion*.<sup>11</sup> In Gil Vicente's allusion, the country is designated by its pre-Israelite and biblical name of Canaan, which, in fact, was used by certain Sephardic communities as a pejorative name for their non-Jewish persecutors.<sup>12</sup>

A further remark may be added in regard to the mention of Pharaoh as the ever-renascent *Judenfeind*. Schwarz quotes the following verses which are quite *à propos*:

Livraste-o de hum Pharaó,  
 Por santo prodigio novo,  
 De outio Pharaó mais duro  
 Outra vez livra o teu povo<sup>13</sup>

In referring to Pharaoh, Gil Vicente makes use of *espantar* in two tenses, the past as an indication of the biblical narrative and the future as an expression of hope that future tyrants will be similarly punished.<sup>14</sup>

GEORGE T. ARTOLA

WILLIAM A. EICHENGREEN

*Baltimore, Maryland*

## LOWELL, HOOD AND THE PUN

In a Lowell Institute lecture delivered in 1855, James Russell Lowell praised the puns of Thomas Hood,<sup>1</sup> and it seems likely that

<sup>11</sup> The following *fórmula de casamento* is recorded by Samuel Schwarz, *Os Cristãos novos em Portugal no século XX*, Lisbon, 1925, p. 78. "Em nome de Deus de Abrahão, Isac e Jacob eu vos uno Cumprí vós a sua benção"

<sup>12</sup> Braunstein, Baruch, *The Chuetas of Majorca*, New York, 1936, p. 105.

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 64.

<sup>14</sup> Schwarz, *ibid.*, p. 69, cites the following prayer, in which a similar shift of tense may be observed. "Adonai reina; Adonai reinou, Adonai para sempre nos faça mercê."

<sup>1</sup> "Humor, Wit, Fun and Satire," in *The Function of the Poet and other Essays*, ed. Albert Mordell (Boston, 1920), pp. 49-50.

Hood's example may have had something to do with Lowell's tendency to pun frequently in *The Biglow Papers* and *A Fable for Critics*. Hood's wild beasts who could not "prey in their own way,"<sup>2</sup> quoted by Lowell in his lecture, may have suggested the lines in "The Pious Editor's Creed,"

I du believe in special ways  
O' prayin' an' convartin';  
. . . . .  
I mean in preyin' till one busts  
On wut the party chooses,  
An' in convartin' public trusts  
To very privit uses<sup>3</sup>

Hood's Ben Battle in "Faithless Nelly Gray" was a bold soldier,

But a cannon-ball took off his legs  
So he laid down his arms

With Ben may be compared Lowell's Birdofredum Sawin who is forced to surrender his gun in order to get back his wooden leg from the negro Pomp:

However, ez there worn't no help, I finally give in  
An' heft my arms away to get my leg safe back agin.<sup>4</sup>

These are the only instances apparently in which Lowell and Hood played on the same words, but Lowell's manner of punning is so much like that of Hood that Paul Elmer More's comment on Hood's puns might justly be applied to Lowell's. Sometimes, said More, Hood relied on mere similarity of sound, "but more often there is a kind of accompanying twist in the situation itself, playful or grotesque, which raises the humor above the exasperation of sheer verbicide."<sup>5</sup>

ARTHUR VOSS

Lake Forest College

<sup>2</sup> In "The Monkey-Martyr."

<sup>3</sup> *The Biglow Papers* (Riverside Ed. of Lowell's *Writings*, Vol. VIII), pp. 100-101.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 146.

<sup>5</sup> "Thomas Hood," in *Shelburne Essays, Seventh Series* (Boston, 1910), pp. 57-58.

## REVIEWS

*Deutsche Literaturgeschichte in Grundzügen.* Die Epochen deutscher Dichtung in Einzeldarstellungen. Hrsg. v. B. BOESCH. Bern: A. Francke Verlag, 1946. Pp. 363. s. fr. 14. 80.

Auch ohne die geistigen und materiellen Verheerungen der jüngsten Vergangenheit war die Zeit reif für eine Neu-Interpretation der Literatur, Blickpunkte und Maßstäbe haben sich in den zwanzig Jahren seit dem Erscheinen des berühmten *Aufriß der deutschen Literaturgeschichte* (*Zs. f. Deutschkunde* Bd 41 (1927) ff.) erheblich verschoben, die Ausbildung neuer Methoden hat manches neue Ergebnis gezeitigt. Ästhetische und pädagogische Nachteile einer Literaturbetrachtung aus vielen Federn werden mehr als aufgewogen, wenn jedes Teilgebiet von einem Kenner behandelt wird, so daß Unzuständigkeit oder Befangenheit in Vorurteilen ausgeschaltet ist. Solche Darstellung ist nicht mehr aus einem Guß und einem Geist, gewisse Werke (in unserm Fall z. B. *Freidank*, Wittenwilers *Ring*) werden unter den verschiedenen Aspekten der Betrachter verschiedener Epochen zu verschiedenen Erscheinungen; aber grade das Prismatische anstelle des Pragmatischen bezeichnet gut den Stand der literaturwissenschaftlichen Forschung.

Die Zeitumstände haben die Ausschaltung in Deutschland wirkender Gelehrter erzwungen. Da aber der Einstrom deutscher Bücher, Zeitschriften, Forschungsergebnisse aus dem Reich in die Schweiz niemals unterbrochen war, sind die 'deutschen' Gesichtspunkte bei den Schweizer Germanisten akzeptiert, die Beschränkung auf Schweizer Federn sollte nicht nur keine geistige zur Folge haben, sondern im Gegenteil eine Urteilsweite befördern, die im Reich schon lange verloren gegangen war. Umso erstaunlicher, daß die beiden überragenden Hohepunkte des Sammelbandes von den beiden Reichsdeutschen unter den Beiträgern stammen, von Ranke (Basel) und Strich (Bern).

Im einen Fall trifft die geistvollste Darstellung mit der glänzenden Epoche der höfischen Klassik zusammen, so daß der tiefe Einblick des Betrachters belohnt wird durch die Grösse des Gegenstandes. Der andere Hohepunkt literarischen Lebens in Deutschland—600 Jahre später—hat leider eine so wenig adäquate Darstellung gefunden, daß mehr Licht und Gewicht auf den Barock (Strich) fällt, als für die Balance des Ganzen gut ist. Dennoch ist der allgemeine Eindruck des Werkes ein uberaus günstiger: die umsichtig klarende Behandlung der Stil-Epochen

verliert sich nie ins Kleinliche, laßt aber dabei die Einzellerscheinung nie aus dem Auge; Belehrung wird nie zur blossen Besserwisserei; die Begrenzung der Abschnitte ist nie schematisch, kaum je gewaltsam. Die schwere Aufgabe, die literarischen Erscheinungen mit allen andern geistigen Manifestationen einer Epoche so zu verbinden, daß sie zu Wort-Führern eines Zeitabschnitts werden, ist im Ganzen geglückt.

Burkhards straffe Behandlung der frühen Literatur bis 1160 leidet etwas unter seiner zahlflussigen Schreibe. Doch scheinen mir die wichtigen Akzente überall richtig gesetzt. Im Widerspruch zu ihm befinde ich mich nur bei seinem Versuch, das *Geistliche Drama* auf frühe Ostertropen des 10. Jahrhunderts zurückzuführen. aus Frage und Antwort am leeren Grabe (*Matth.* 28. 5-7) habe sich das dramatische Zwiegespräch entwickelt. Es ist ja wohl bereits kanonisch, die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geist der Mysterie abzuleiten. Ich halte es an der Zeit, darauf hinzuweisen, daß die Auflösung biblischer Erzählung in Frage und Bestätigung überhaupt keinen dialektischen Charakter hat, sondern auf liturgischer Technik beruht: 'Wen sucht ihr?'—'Jesus, den Gekreuzigten'—'Er ist nicht hier. Er ist erstanden.' Das ist nicht die Keimzelle eines *sic et non*, sondern Aussage in der Form höherer Intensität. Das ist keine dialektische Auseinander-Setzung, sondern ein Auseinander-Legen, ein emphatisches Aussagen, eine Art von liturgischem Sperrdruck, der den Höhepunkt des Gottesdienstes starker beleuchtet. Oder sind vielleicht die *Taufgelobnisse* des 8. Jahrhunderts auch schon Keimzellen des Dramas?

In Rankes Darstellung der hofischen Dichtung sind die Forschungsergebnisse vor allem Schneiders, de Boors, Schwieterings zu einem vollkommenen Ganzen verarbeitet. Es steht zu hoffen, daß das hier gegebene Bild der mhd. Klassik überall ältere, oft phliströse Anschauungen ersetzt. Mich wundert nur, warum Ranke der Reinmar-Walther 'Fehde' ein biographisches Gewicht beilegt; ich sehe es als ein konzertantes Kampfspiel, als ein 'Doppelkonzert,' aus dem für die realen Lebensumstände nichts abzulesen ist. Die Rollen von Dichtung und Leben sind ja damals dahin vertauscht, daß die Dichtung weit höher steht als die Realität: nicht die Dichtung läuft der Wirklichkeit nach, sondern das Leben folgt dem in der Poesie gegebenen Vor-Bild. Könnte die Turnier-Idee des 'Sich-messens' nicht in eine transzendente 'Fehde' transponiert sein?—Daß bei Walthers volkstümlichen Liedern "lateinische Vagantenpoesie und frühdeutsche Lyrik Pate gestanden haben," ist eine unbefriedigende Aussage. Was weiß man über die 'frühdeutsche' Lyrik? Und woher kommt denn die Vagantenpoesie? Wer hat bei ihr Pate gestanden? Was war sie, bevor sie in die Hände der Vaganten geriet?—Schließlich hat mich noch frappiert, daß der Stricker "aus der Gegend von Nürnberg" stammt. Karlsruhe-Heilbronn würde ich sagen.—Doch sollen diese

kleinlichen Ausstellungen das Lob nicht beeinträchtigen, das der hohen Schönheit und prachtvollen Dichte der Rankeschen Arbeit zukommt.

Boesch hat es mit seinem Abschnitt (1250-1500) schwerer. Nichts mehr von der zarten Erdenferne und vornehmen Gedampftheit klassischer Tone. Der Übertritt von dem Ranke-Kapitel in das von Boesch ist wirklich der aus einer besonnenen Gartenlandschaft in schluchtenreiches Hochgebirge, von dem Lawinen herunterdonnern. Das Formlos-Garende spiegelt sich sogar in der irrationalen Sprache des Darstellers. Seiner notgedrungenen rapiden Übersicht wird man Auslassungen nachsehen. Warum aber kein Wort über die Historiographie? Boesch hat sich das reizvolle Kapitel entgehen lassen, wie mit dem Absinken des Universalismus der Abstieg von Welt- zu Stad- zu Familienchronik Hand in Hand geht und sich dabei die universale Hochsprache immer starker in Mundart zersetzt. Eike, Gottfried Hagen, Jansen Enikel, Ottokar, Johannes Rothe darf man nicht auslassen.—Zu den neuen Kunstmitteln nach der Auflösung der Reimverse gehört vor allem die Synonymik, der Schritt also vom Klang- zum Bedeutungsreim. Denn auch das ist ein Doppeln, wobei aber nicht mehr der Laut, sondern der Wortsinn entscheidend ist. Auch das sollte nicht fehlen.—Endlich: wie darf man von Frauenlobs "unverschämtem Stolz auf das von ihm fabrizierte Wortgepränge" sprechen, wenn wir doch zu seinem subjektiven Stolz objektive Beweise in Menge haben, wie sehr er den Ansprüchen, die seine Umwelt an Dichtung stellte, genügt hat.—Den Stil der *Geistlichen Spiele* des 13. Jahrhunderts mit Hartmanns Wortkunst zu verknüpfen, erscheint mir unter jedem Gesichtspunkt als grober Fehler (selbst wenn Boesch dabei Rankes mir noch nicht bekanntem Buch *Das Osternspiel von Muri* (Aarau 1944) folgen sollte).—Es ist ja richtig, daß das *Schembartlaufen* am Anfang einer Tradition steht, die zu Hans Sachs führt. Ein interessantes Schiff, das des Schembart, mit seiner Fracht von Teufeln und Narren. Der geprellte, dumme Teufel ist schon ein Vaganten- und Stricker-Requisit, wobei ich anmerken möchte, daß Teufel und Narren im Hochmittelalter dasselbe sind, nur auf verschiedenen sozialen Stufen: der Teufel ist in der religiös gestuften Hierarchie, was im Volkstum der Narr ist. Im bürgerlichen Mittelalter steigt dann der Narr in die Literatur auf; der Weg führt also vom Stricker, zum Schembart, zu Sebastian Brant zu Sachs. Hierbei bin ich schon ins 16. Jahrhundert fortgeschritten, in den Bezirk von Berigers *Zeitalter des Humanismus und der Reformation*. Unter dem überstarken Einfluß Gunther Müllers verwirft er den "Verlegenheits-Begriff" Renaissance und rechtfertigt das Wort vom "Renaissance-Chaos" dadurch, daß er die Geschichte der Renaissance-Literatur erst nach ihrem Ende beginnt. Er spricht von lauter zweiten Schritten, die in eine Irre zu führen scheinen, halt man die ersten nicht daneben.

Arigo, Steinhöwel, Geiler, Wimpfeling bleiben unerwähnt, von den Verdeutschungen Poggios, Boccaccios, Äsops, Terenz', Livius', Casars kein Wort.—Daß Hutten nur gegen die politischen Ambitionen der Kirche kämpft, trafe vielleicht für Walther zu, reicht aber für Hutten nicht aus, der die Kirche als geistige Macht ebenfalls attackiert.—Das über Luthers Verhältnis zur Sprache innig, aber ohne Kenntnis der Details Gesagte ist ein Rückfall zum jungen Jakob Grimm, der Neuhochdeutsch einen protestantischen Dialekt genannt hat. An Unrichtigkeiten ist kein Mangel, wozu noch ernste Lucken im Literaturnachweis kommen (z. B. Böcking, D. F. Strauß für Hutten; Reimann für Seb. Franck; Ricarda Huch, *Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung* für den ganzen Zeitraum); doch gelingt Berigers klarer und kraftiger Darstellung ein recht treffendes Bild der Literatur im eigentlichen Zeitalter Luthers.

Strichs *Barock*, ein Muster induktiver Darstellung, die den jeweiligen Einzelercheinungen ihren Platz im organischen Ganzen mit großartiger Sicherheit zuweist, wird der Barock-Verachtung ein Ende machen. Der Höhepunkt nicht nur des Kapitels sondern des ganzen Buchs scheint mir der geniale Abschnitt über Gesellschaftsdichtung (S. 161-164) mit der Feststellung, daß im Barock die Antwort auf die Frage: was ist vornehm? lautet: das Entlegene, das Gesuchte, das Un-gemeine.—Das Gryphius-Sonett mit seinen eins auf das andere aufgesetzten Bildern hat eine gradezu wortliche Entsprechung beim Meister Eckhart, könnte also ebenso gut wie auf Seite 150 auch auf 159 im Abschnitt über die Mystik stehen; was ja wieder nur die ungeheure Einheitlichkeit und den Synthetismus des Barock illustriert. So läßt sich die treffende Bemerkung über einen gewissen Katholizismus sogar bei treuen Protestanten, die allesamt recht unlutherisch sind, noch dahin ausdehnen, daß das Konvertieren nicht an den Grenzen der Konfessionen Halt macht: laue Katholiken werden in eifrige 'konvertiert.'

Es sagt viel zum Lobe Wehrlis, daß sein *Zeitalter der Aufklärung* neben Strich voll bestehen kann; er ist ein feinfingriger Klarer und Sonderer der verschlungenen Faden, die vom *Barock* zum *Sturm und Drang* laufen. Nur sollte die *Anakreontik* nicht gar so schlecht wegkommen; sie ist mit ihrem Bürger-Barock doch immerhin auch eine Überwindung des Abgelebten. Und daß der Bürger anstelle des Hohen Herrn sich selbst das Weinlaub ins Haar flicht, ist doch immerhin schwaches Wetterleuchten einer kommenden Revolution. Daß Wehrlis Ordnungsprinzip nach Gattungen seine Nachteile hat, wird offenkundig bei Lessing Dramatisierung einer Fabel (Ring-Fabel), überhaupt dem Lehrgedicht *Nathan*, das sich Theaterstück nennt, auch bei Gellerts rührenden Lustspielen, die ja auf Richardsons Romanen fassen.

An Ermatingers impotenter Darstellung ist das krasse Mißverhältnis zwischen der Breite der Darstellung und der Einsichten

bedauerlich. Seine *Literatur der Klassik und des Idealismus* beansprucht ein Viertel des ganzen Buchs, oft genug für Tratsch dieser Art: "Vielleicht daß Lenz, der ausserlich ein zierliches Burschchen war, wenn er in seiner livländischen Heimat geblieben wäre, als abseitiger Lokaldichter ein ruhiges Leben bis ins hohe Alter hatte führen können." Zu ähnlichen Plattheiten geben Schubart, Maler Müller vor allem natürlich die *Lucinde* Anlaß. Daß der *Sturm und Drang* Herrn Ermatinger "heute kuhl läßt" ist uns heute weniger wichtig, als warum er damals niemanden kuhl ließ.

Gut daß die beiden letzten Abschnitte des Buchs — Zachs *Realismus* (1830-1885) und Bettex' *Moderne Literatur* (1885-1933) den üblen Eindruck des Klassik-Kapitels wieder verwischen. Zach erhebt sich fast zu der Gediegenheit Wehrli's, wenn er die Verbreiterung der Bildung gegen ihre Verflachung balanciert und das Aufkommen eines neuen Standes der Halbgebildeten beschreibt: aus der Aristokratie der Dichter und Denker wird eine Demokratie der Bildungsphilister, deren Schiffbruch blutige Gegenwartsgeschichte ist. Davon handelt dann Bettex mit Geschmack und Geschick. Manchmal setzt er zu starke Akzente. Gumpenbergs Parodien 'genial' zu nennen und aus Nietzsche herzuleiten, hat selbst nur parodischen Wert; die Zensur "sehr arm an aufbauendem Sinn" zu Heinrich Manns Zeitromanen ist anfechtbar; und die liebe verdrehte Franziska Reventlow erhält die literarhistorische Marke: "Die zur Schwabinger Hetäre gewordene Gräfin." — Ach Gottchen.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

*The Greek Anthology in France and in the Latin Writers of the Netherlands to the Year 1800.* By JAMES HUTTON. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1946. Pp. xi + 822, *transmutantur* pp. 259-274, 275-306.

Several years ago Professor Henri Peyre chose as theme of a thoughtful address given at a dinner of the Modern Language Association the urgent need to reassess the impact of Greek authors on Renaissance and modern literatures. If memory serves, he cited Merrill's study of Du Bellay's Platonism as the one exemplary American contribution until that date. He might well have added Professor James Hutton's meticulous volume *The Greek Anthology in Italy to the Year 1800*, issued in 1935 under the adoptive imprint of the Cornell Studies in English. The result of a careful perquisition of Latin and vernacular writers in Italy, that volume brought to light and assembled the translations, plagiarisms, and allusions originating in the *Greek Anthology*. Continuing his

arduous task of illuminating the Greek elements in Renaissance and post-Renaissance literatures, Hutton has investigated those ingredients of the *Anthology* reflected in French and Netherlandish writers and has produced a companion volume in the Cornell Studies in Classical Philology.

Here again the undertaking of source study is fraught with complication. Sometimes the influence has come directly from the edition of the epigrams first published at Florence in the almost spurious version of the Byzantine Planudes (1494) or from one of the other editions which preceded Jacob's definitive corpus of 1813-17. Sometimes the influence was exerted through a neo-Latin intermediary—as Colin Bucher imitated Rufinus through Ange-rano—or even from another writer in the vernacular—as Desportes, who never saw the Greek text, translated *via* Tansillo. Even if some attributions remain in doubt, the net result of his methodic compilation and collation, as Hutton remarks, is that the reader sees “a considerable number of literary relationships spring to light, as it were, spontaneously.” By extending his researches beyond the Renaissance, Hutton has been required to utilise not only the Planudean collection, but the subsequent Palatine version.

The author set for himself a task of considerable magnitude. He has had to investigate the French neo-Latinists from Guillaume de la Mare (1451-1525) to Georges-Charles de Lurienne (1732-94), Netherlandish neo-Latins from Erasmus to Hieronymus de Bosch, and French vernacular writers from Clément Marot to Chénier. He has had to read not only all the works of these writers, some of them almost inaccessible, but also all the standard scholarship about them, particularly to see what attributions and sources were already commonly accepted. Certainly scores of additional writers were examined whose works proved to contain no reminiscences of the *Anthology*. In many cases Hutton has established attributions and relationships which will necessarily appear in future editions of some of the major writers treated. Not only do literary relationships here become “spontaneously” apparent, but errors of previous scholarship become “spontaneously” corrected. Thus, to quote only a few examples, Hutton modestly disproves Lavaud's statement that Desportes borrowed nothing from Marullus, notes that several poems of Colin Bucher held by Denais to be autobiographical are mere translations, shows the impossibility of Laumonier's belief that Ronsard found echoes of the *Anthology* in Muret's *Juvenilia*. Hutton is quite sympathetic to the many “researchers [who] have fallen into the trap of finding particular sources of epigrams which, being absent from Planudes, were unknown to the sixteenth century” (p. 49).

Because of the profusion of themes treated, including a few which did not appear in the *Anthology*, this volume not only furnishes a new appraisal of the thematic quality of French literature, but



prepares the way for more fruitful and accurate source studies in the future. Hutton shows himself constantly interested in the variety of ways Greek themes and points are incorporated into French writings.

The whole artistic activity of the humanists with the Greek epigrams can be stated in their own terms as translations (*translatio* or *interpretatio*), multiple translation (*variae interpretationes*), replies (*responsa*), imitation (*imitatio*), and allusion (*allusio*). The regular occurrence of all these methods of treatment implies that the distinctions were not only conscious, but were derived from the rhetorical instruction of the humanist schools (p. 29).

Although Hutton often investigates the procedures by which individual writers adapt the earlier epigrams (e. g., Chénier's notations, quotations, translations, and blendings), his researches will facilitate considerable further work on influence and imitation. Some of the questions which may now be more easily answered: Granted the several types of Greek epigram (anecdotal, moral, comic, satirical, votive, erotic), which types have been favored by individual writers, schools, and periods? Similarly, which particular epigrams have been favored by individual writers, schools, and periods?

That these questions may be more readily answered, Hutton supplies (as in his earlier volume) a Register containing under each epigram the translations or adaptations made of it in chronological order. While a majority of the epigrams were echoed only a few times, and some only once, three of them enjoyed a preponderant popularity. Epigrams 5.78 and 6.1 were echoed forty-five times apiece. Epigram 9.440, which "enjoyed immense popularity apart from the *Anthology*," was adapted sixty-six times. Comparison with the Register in the earlier volume shows that this popularity was paralleled in the experience of Italy. Which are the three themes which captivated so completely continental writers between 1500 and 1800? These are two amatory epigrams of Plato: "My soul was on my lips as I was kissing Agathon. Poor soul! She came hoping to cross over to him," and "Lais, whose haughty beauty made mock of Greece, I, who once had a swarm of young lovers at my doors, dedicate my mirror to Aphrodite, since I do not wish to look at myself as I am and cannot look upon myself as I once was." Lastly, 9.440 is a declamatory piece attributed to Moschus in which Cypris describes the lovable but cunning traits of her son Eros, who has wandered astray.

One of the most absorbing end-products of this study concerns the manner in which imitated or adopted themes are integrated into the creative processes of individual writers. In each borrowing the theme is viewed "*à travers un tempérament*" and it is curious to note how the force of that temperament will frequently transmute the original text to make it conform to the spirit and time of the

adapter—or, as will occur less frequently, how the original text will exert centripetal force, will attract or restrict the temperament.

An obvious example of the first occurrence is Colin Bucher's treatment of the simple epigram of Capito (5 67): "Beauty without charm only pleases us, but does not hold us; it is like a bait floating without a hook." Bucher, writing before 1535, adopts this theme and amplifies it into a regular rondeau of thirteen lines, typical in language, style, and form of the poetry of the nascent 1500's. The seventeenth-century authors indulged in *amplificatio* almost as uneconomically as the sixteenth, even though their style was frequently more chastened and elegant. Thus when Boileau adopted the monostich (9 455), "What Apollo might say about Homer: I sang the song and divine Homer wrote it down," it became a nine-line epigram overladen with the metaphoric trappings by which the neo-classicists advertised their classicism. "troupe des neuf sœurs," "rives du Permesse," "bois de Lauriers," "sacré vallon" Claude Brossette was moved to chide Boileau for his prolixity. Boileau rationalises that without his "narration assés vive, la pensée n'est point en son jour." (Compare his Horatian verse, "J'évite d'être long et je deviens obscur.") By its very compactness of wording, the Greek epigram served to point out the difference between Greek expression and French neo-classic expression, a dissimilarity discernible, if less patently, in regular tragedy of both the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The same disinclination or inability to equal Hellenic economy of wording and imagery is again apparent among the neo-classicists of the Enlightenment. When Chénier, "the chosen vessel of eighteenth-century Hellenism," adapted Anyte's epigram on the death of Myro's locust and cicada or the Greek couplet on the incestuous Pasiphae, even he who studied so attentively Greek expression, metaphor, and themes and best understood the lexis and dianoia of Greek poetry, managed to Gallicise its basic nature by modes of expression and elaboration. The hundreds of borrowings patiently compiled by Professor Hutton not only help us to assess just what neo-classicism is, but in like wise, what it is not.

In sum, Professor Hutton has provided us with a valuable study which, complementing his earlier volume, exceeds the already ambitious aim which he set for his efforts. Beyond expanding our knowledge of the fortunes of the *Greek Anthology* his researches shed new light on the subject of Renaissance and post-Renaissance epigrams in general. He abstracts and analyses many theories on this literary form (in Robortello, Sébilet, Scaliger, Corréa, and others). Beyond treating of a prescribed number of themes handed down in a single corpus, Hutton finds himself tracing the fortunes of some of the most popular motifs in French literature. Thus, he explains the antecedence of the golden letters which the aged Gil Blas posted over his portal ("Inveni portum, etc.") and of Vol-

taire's famous quatrain on the unfortunate snake which bit Jean Fréron. And finally, Hutton has established a repertorium of just about every type and degree of imitation to be encountered during a lengthy period when imitation was one of the crucial elements of literary theory and practice.

ROBERT J. CLEMENTS

*The Pennsylvania State College*

*Le Registre de La Grange, 1659-1685, reproduit en fac-similé avec un index et une notice sur La Grange et sa part dans le théâtre de Molière. I. Registre et Index. II. Notice sur La Grange et son œuvre, comparaison des anciens registres de la Comédie Française, historique des premiers recueils de Molière.* Par BERT EDWARD YOUNG et GRACE PHILPUTT YOUNG. Paris: E. Droz. [Bloomington: Indiana University Bookstore], 1947. Pp. 387 + 189. \$10.00. (Bibliothèque des la Société des Historiens du théâtre XXIII.)

Eighty years ago Jules Bonnassies<sup>1</sup> protested vigorously against the directors of the Comédie Française because they would not publish documents in their possession or allow the public to examine them. Eight years later the Comédie Française made a partial reply by bringing out the *Registre de La Grange*, with an introduction, but without commentary or index, a work that has been essential to all scholars seriously interested in Molière and the theater of his time. The fact that this publication is now out of print would have furnished sufficient cause for this new edition by Dr. and Mrs. Young. But they have given us much more than that. They have reproduced the original manuscript in facsimile with an ample index and have added in a second volume a study of the work and its author.

They have drawn an engaging portrait of La Grange, Molière's first lieutenant, who played the young lover in many of his comedies, kept the troupe together after the master's death, and had a large part in the creation of the Comédie Française. They have traced the history of the manuscript, acquired by the Comédie Française in 1785, loaned for many years to an actress, for many others to a scholar, and saved from a fire in 1900 by the late Jules Couët, to whom the new edition is dedicated. They have pointed out various inaccuracies both in the manuscript and in the edition of 1876, have compared the work of La Grange with the frag-

<sup>1</sup> *Comédie Française Notice historique sur les anciens bâtiments*, Paris, 1868, pp. 6, 7.

mentary productions of La Thorillière and Hubert, as well as with the official *Registres* of 1673-85. They have added a chapter on the 1682 edition of Molière, which owes its existence chiefly to La Grange. The second volume is illustrated with reproductions of twenty-two documents, title-pages, etc. Their work has, too, the romantic interest of meeting the German invaders at Abbeville in 1940 and of surviving their bombardment of the town. A few copies left France late in 1947 to bring us evidence that excellent printing is still being done there.

I have very few suggestions to make:

Tome I, p. 361, *read* Capucin revolté ou deffroqué (correctly given in the index, p. 368). P. 366, col. 2, l. 28, *read* petites grâces. Tome II, pp. 47-8, a letter is quoted from Mlle Bernard to La Grange requesting that no comedy be played after her tragedy on "mercredi,"<sup>2</sup> and the conclusion is reached that La Grange settled the matter to the advantage of the author; this he probably did, but not in the way she asked him to do, for a comedy was acted after her tragedy at the Wednesday performance, La Grange could evidently say "no" to a woman when he knew what was best for her. P. 66, last line, *for* Valasius *read* Valamir. P. 68, the editors follow Mèlèse, who follows Reynier in believing that there are allusions in the text of Thomas Corneille's *Inconnu* to a scandal in which Molière's widow was involved, but to arrive at such a conclusion one has to torture the text of the *Inconnu* and overlook its obvious meaning, cf. my *History of French Dramatic Literature*, Part IV, p. 912. P. 101, to the list of errors in the 1876 edition of La Grange should be added that of Oct. 5, 1684, when the receipt is given as 314 fr. instead of 1314 fr. On the next day this edition gives the receipt, not as 57 fr., 10 s., but as 57 blank fr., 10 s.; apparently the manuscript was correct, but there was not enough ink for the third figure.

These comments diminish little the value of the work, which is one of the major contributions made in this century to Molière studies. I hope that the response of American scholars and libraries will be gratifying to Dr. Young, who has devoted many years of his life to this admirable undertaking.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

---

<sup>2</sup> Mlle Bernard was feminine enough not to date her letter, but a reference in it to the fact that the play had been acted after the charges for admission to the theater had been reduced makes it clear that it could not have been written before Thursday, Feb. 24, 1689. "Mercredi" must consequently refer to March 2, when for the first time and in spite of the author's letter a comedy was played after her *Laodamie*. That La Grange was justified in doing what she asked him not to do is shown by the fact that the receipts rose from 542 fr., 10 s. on Feb. 28, when the tragedy was played alone, to 928 fr., 10 s., when it was followed by *les Précieuses ridicules*. Cf. my *Comédie Française*, Baltimore, 1941, pp. 94-5.

A *Bibliographical List of Plays in the French Language 1700-1789*. By CLARENCE D. BRENNER. Berkeley, California: The Associated Students' Store, 1947. Pp. vii + 229, double columns, lithoprinted. \$10.00

This work consists of two parts: a list of 11,662 French plays and operas composed in 1700-89, arranged alphabetically under the names of their authors, or, if these are unknown, under "anonyme", then, the same plays and operas arranged alphabetically under their titles and with numbers referring to the first list. Part I gives the date of first performance and of first publication, or, if the play was not published, the location of the manuscript. It also indicates whether the play is in verse or prose, its genre, and the number of its acts. Part II is, in a sense, an index to Part I. Dr. Brenner's undertaking, carried out with infinite patience and with remarkable accuracy, has produced a book that will be invaluable to students of the eighteenth century and to all who are concerned with cataloguing plays. It is unfortunate that, to reduce the cost, the author has had to have the work lithoprinted in such minute characters that a person of normal vision who consults it will have to use a reading-glass. For this the blame should be laid, not on Dr. Brenner, but on organizations that are supposed to aid scholars by financing the results of their labors and which have not come to his assistance.

Year before last I went over his work while he was seeking a publisher and made him a certain number of suggestions. Since then other information has reached me that I should have been glad to pass on to him if I had seen his proof. What I have found amounts to very little in comparison with the thousands of flawless entries. The following corrections can easily be added in the margins of the book:

P. 34, de Belloy's *Gabrielle de Vergy* was played at Versailles in 1770 and at Rouen in 1772, both performances preceding by several years the first at the Comédie Française. The same author's *Pierre le Cruel* is omitted. It should be entered as acted on May 20, 1772, and as published, Amsterdam, Rey, et Paris, Duchesne, 1775. P. 37, *Don Ramir et Zaida* is listed under Boissy, in collaboration with La Chazette, but the manuscript at the Bibliothèque Nationale attributes it only to La Chassette (a name stupidly altered by some unknown person to La Chaussée). According to Lérès, Boissy denied that he was the author. The play should be transferred to p. 81, if the spelling of the manuscript is followed. P. 47, the author of *Coriolan* is given as Chaligny Des Plaines, and no mention is made of the fact that there is a manuscript of it at the Bibliothèque Nationale. The author's name is there given as Chaligny de Plaine, or simply as Chaligny. Pp. 85 and 128, the *Caliste* of La Place's *Théâtre anglais* should not be regarded as the same play as the anonymous *Caliste* acted in 1750, nor is there any good reason for attributing the latter to Thibouville. A contemporary, Fréron (*Année littéraire*, 1760 (8), pp. 169-73), speaks of them as different plays, the first by Du Bocage, the second probably by Mauprié, though often assigned to Sérán de la Tour.

P 86, there is at the Bibliothèque Nationale a complete manuscript of La Place's *Jeanne d'Angleterre*. P 89, it should be noted that "Saint Pétersbourg," indicated on the title-page of Le Blanc's *Druides* as the place of publication, is a disguise for some French town, and that the day when his *Manco Capac* was first performed was June 13, as indicated by the *Registres* of the Comédie Française and Joannidès, not June 12, as shown erroneously on the title-page. *Thélamure* was probably written by Thibouville; the attribution to Denise Lebrun is due to one of Paul Lacroix's many intuitions. P 98, there is a nearly complete manuscript of Mauger's *Cosroes* at the Arsenal. P. 124, Saurin's *Blanche et Guiscard* is an adaptation, by no means a translation, of Thomson's *Tancred and Sigismunda*. P 128, Thibouville's *Namur*, so far as I have been able to determine, was never published. Brenner reproduces Quérard's notation, "Paris, 1759, 12°," but, as Quérard entitles the play *Ramir*, he must be adopting a misprint in the *Almanach des Spectacles* and mistaking the date of performance given there for the date of publication. P 132, the first edition of Voltaire's *Mahomet* was published at Brussels in 1742, the first edition of *l'Orphelin de la Chine* by Cramer at Geneva; for the latter cf. L. Jordan in *RHL*, xix (1912), 638-9.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

---

Richard Beer-Hofmann, *Werk und Weltbild des Dichters*, von OTTO OBERHOLZER: Bern, A. Francke Verlag, 1947. Pp. 272.

Ever since Hermann Bahr in the Eighteen-Nineties introduced the concept of "Jungwien," it has been customary among literary historians to refer to Arthur Schnitzler and Hugo von Hofmannsthal as the two leading representatives of the group and to include Richard Beer-Hofmann as one of the satellites revolving about these two central suns, a minor figure comparable to Peter Altenberg, Felix Salten, or Leopold Adrian. Such an attitude may have been justified on the basis of Beer-Hofmann's *Novellen* of 1893 or *Der Tod Georgs* of 1900. It was no longer tenable after the appearance of *Der Graf von Charolais* in 1904, which won for the dramatist the "Volksschillerpreis," and it certainly cannot be maintained today after the publication of *Jaakobs Traum* in 1918 and *Der junge David* in 1933. Indeed, Hermann Bahr specifically noted in his diary on January 1, 1921, that the pillars of "Jungwien" from the very beginning were Schnitzler, Beer-Hofmann, and Hofmannsthal. Furthermore, Hofmannsthal's letters, published in recent years, clearly reveal that he looked upon Beer-Hofmann not as a follower but as an inspirer and literary mentor.

Oberholzer's book now boldly espouses the thesis that Beer-Hofmann was probably the central figure of "Jungwien," even though he was the least prolific of the group. Oberholzer analyzes in great detail the ideological content of Beer-Hofmann's lyrics, tales, and dramas, and devotes less attention to the form in which the ideas were clothed. He accepts the traditional view that

"Jungwien" was the literary expression of the mood of decadence, which characterized Vienna from the death of Grillparzer to the Nazi-catastrophe that overwhelmed this city in 1938 and that compelled Beer-Hofmann to flee for refuge to America. This traditional view may have to be modified. The most original contribution of "Jungwien" may some day be seen to lie not in the mirroring of Decadence but in the revolt against it. That this revolt was not always successful does not detract from its significance. Even Hofmannsthal, in his early work such as *Der Tor und der Tod*, already showed a clear perception of the dangers of Decadence and he repeatedly urged escape to a more active, a more responsible existence. It is true that he himself failed to make good this escape, as he confessed not only through the mask of Lord Chandos but also in *Der Schwierige*, but therein lies his tragedy. Beer-Hofmann, however, did find salvation from Viennese Decadence in a rediscovery of his Jewish heritage. He became the foremost singer of the Jewish Renaissance in the German tongue. Oberholzer hints at this transformation of an Austrian aesthete into a neo-biblical bard, but he hesitates to venture too far on this difficult spiritual terrain.

Beer-Hofmann lived in two worlds: Vienna of yesteryear and Judea of the pre-Christian era and of a dawning day. Oberholzer in his extensive study understands and, on the whole, evaluates correctly Beer-Hofmann's Austrian aspects and his rôle in German letters. He does not see or chooses to ignore Beer-Hofmann's significance as the contemporary of Theodor Herzl, the founder of Zionism, and of Martin Buber, the philosopher of Jewish Rebirth, both of whom were his friends and spiritual allies. The richness of Beer-Hofmann's personality stemmed from his being embedded in two complex cultures, the Danubian and the Hebraic. His work was a unique synthesis of both. He remained to the end a foe of cultural monism. On the eve of 1933, he penned his answer to the militant *Weltanschauung* which was to make him homeless in the city of his birth: just as it does not pay for an individual to live solely for himself, so too it does not pay for a people to live solely for its own aggrandizement. Oberholzer attempts to define Beer-Hofmann's relation to the cosmos. He avoids touching on Beer-Hofmann's relation to the burning issues of today, and he completely ignores Beer-Hofmann's last period on American soil.

Oberholzer's book is, therefore, only a torso. The definitive study of Beer-Hofmann and, indeed, of the entire group of "Jungwien" is still to be written. It can perhaps best be written in America, which harbors the *Nachlass* of Schnitzler, Hofmannsthal, and Beer-Hofmann.

SOL LIPTZIN

*College of the City of New York*

*The Metaphysical Society: Victorian Minds in Crisis, 1869-1880.*

By ALAN WILLARD BROWN. New York: Columbia University Press, 1947. Pp. xviii + 372. \$4.50.

Readers in the lives of such great Victorians as Bagehot, Tennyson, J. A. Froude, Ruskin, Huxley, Manning, Gladstone, and Mark Pattison have frequently got glimpses of a very curious discussion group operating in the 1870's, dealing, with amazing nineteenth-century courtesy, in matters of faith and doubt, religion and science. Not until now has any one taken the pains to track down the productions of that versatile group, the Metaphysical Society, and to study its founding, its membership, its influence, its significance for today, and its final dissolution. Professor Alan Willard Brown has undertaken this substantial and important task. He has received from the daughter of Lord Arthur Russell a "full photographic record on microfilm of her nearly complete set of the Papers of the Metaphysical Society." From the Bodleian Library, and from various helpful individuals he has received further material which made possible the first complete and documented study of one of the most fascinating and intellectually influential groups in late-Victorian society. We see the organization rising from the background of the Cambridge "Apostles"; being founded by James Knowles and Tennyson in 1869, growing into a great debating society in which Churchmen and agnostics, theists and rationalists, critics and philosophers candidly argued their several positions; then after giving a stimulus to such new journals as the *Contemporary Review*, the *Nineteenth Century*, and *Mind*, showing its continuing influence in the Society for Psychical Research, the Aristotelian Society, and the Synthetic Society. It is truly an absorbing story for any one interested in what the author says is his "true subject," namely, a "faith in discourse which was the dominating feature of the intellectual life of the nineteenth century" (p. xiv). It is important, also, for the light it throws on Victorian journalism, intellectual ferment, and the final Victorian failure to solve the problems which had been so brilliantly stated and analyzed. These problems are not left by the author with the Victorians, but are followed by him into our own day, in two thoughtful final chapters.

Considering the great number of papers to be studied (90), and the great number of members of the society, the author has attempted to convey to us the nature of the society by first describing a typical meeting, based on R. H. Hutton's "Reminiscence" in the *Nineteenth Century* (August, 1885), and then in a later chapter analysing carefully what he calls "the crucial papers." This method has its advantages, and I think that, on the whole, Professor Brown succeeds in making it work. We do get a first-hand impression, for example, in Chapter 5, of the actual confrontation of such "mighty opposites" as Huxley and Manning. And throughout the book there is admirable exactness, thoroughness, and read-



ability. Difficulties first appear in Chapter 6, where the author begins a series of short sketches of the members of the society. There is unavoidable repetition. And the sketches, running through three consecutive chapters, ultimately fall into monotony. Yet it must be admitted that, even with this flaw, Professor Brown's work is highly valuable as a record of a complicated intellectual event of the Victorian 1870's.

Four Appendices include a list of the members of the society, a note on its minute-book, a valuable annotated list (running to twenty-five pages) of the Papers of the Metaphysical Society, and the notice of its dissolution. There is an excellent index. Professor Brown tells us (p. 71) that he hopes one day to undertake a critical edition of the society's papers. This would indeed be a laudable enterprise. May one urge that, in view of the general excellence of the present study, he contemplate a similar work on the Synthetic Society?

CHARLES FREDERICK HARROLD

*The Ohio State University*

*Making the American Mind. Social and Moral Ideas in the McGuffey Readers.* By RICHARD D MOSIER. New York: King's Crown Press. 1947. vii + 207 pp. \$3.00.

*Making the American Mind* is a doctoral dissertation that never quite becomes a book. This is unfortunate, because both the story Dr. Mosier has to tell and the moral which can be drawn from his story are important and interesting. The story concerns the imposition of a "conservative" pattern of thought on the naturally liberal American mind through the agency of the very popular McGuffey readers.

The account begins with a summary of the struggle between Hamiltonians and Jeffersonians for control of the United States. In the open arena of political contest, the Jeffersonians won, and they and the Jacksonians, their successors, retained political power, except for a very few years, until the War Between the States. What was won on the open field was, however, lost in the judiciary through the constitutional interpretations of John Marshall, and, we are given to understand, lost in the training of the young through McGuffey editors' deliberate selection of themes and writers within the Hamiltonian, or "conservative" tradition.

This tradition includes, in Dr. Mosier's view, the development of national rather than state patriotism, an alliance with religion to maintain respect for authority, and a resolute support of "middle class," presumably capitalist, morality. McGuffey's acceptance of the pattern is ascribed by the author to a concern for private property, and "the divine right of men of property to rule."

It is unfortunate that Dr. Mosier lacked the perspective necessary

to do well the job he laid out for himself. What seems to us today a conservative view (in Mosier's definition on p. 74) may very well have been in its own day a new and liberating ideal. Thus the theme of America's "manifest destiny," which is treated by Mosier as conservative nationalism of the Webster type, was actually invented by Jacksonian radicals to provide a basis for national unity despite the differing economic structures of the northern and southern sections of the country and the sectional views of Calhoun for the South and Webster for the North. The phrase was first used by John L. O'Sullivan, editor of *The Democratic Review*, and it was picked up by the "Young America" Democrats of the fifties as well as by advocates of the Mexican War. Opposition to this war was not limited to "pacifists and socialists." There was opposition throughout New England and among antislavery elements in the country, not because of opposition to war in general, but because this was the South's war, a war for the extension of slave territory. These illustrations show how, with the best will in the world, some historical knowledge is essential.

Despite such historical errors as these, there is enough material left to document the thesis that there has been an unholy alliance of Christianity, capitalism, conservatism, and education in the United States which, consciously or not, has tried to suppress one of the vital traditions of American life. This is a useful thing to know, and it points the moral of Dr. Mosier's story: when education defends conservatism, it's not indoctrination.

JOSEPH L. BLAU

*Columbia University*

---

## BRIEF MENTION

---

*The Heresy of Courtly Love.* By ALEXANDER J. DENOMY, C. S. B., Ph. D. New York: The Declan X. McMullen Company, Inc. 1947. Pp. 92. Boston College may well be proud of the first of its new "Candlemas Lectures on Christian Literature." While the irreverent may smile slightly at Father Denomy's explanation of his reason for opening a series of lectures on Christian literature with a discussion of a type of literature that was decidedly not Christian, no one can fail to appreciate the charming, scholarly, and provocative result. He shows briefly the important place of the ideas of Courtly Love in literary and intellectual history. He also gives a very competent and succinct summary of those ideas. He then points out that the ideas of Courtly Love were fundamentally at variance with the moral teachings of Christianity. None of this is new. Its value lies in its graceful and effective expression.

It is when Father Denomy goes on to expound the hypothesis about the source of the ideas of Courtly Love that he has been developing in various articles that he enters on new ground. He

believes that this source can be found in the *Treatise on Love* of the Moslem philosopher Avicenna. He also explains that the dual nature of Andreas Capellanus' *De Amore* and the contrast between Chrétien de Troyes' *Lancelot* and his *Percival* are the result of the idea of "double truth" found in the Moslem writer. Both these suggestions are interesting and provocative. Father Denomy demonstrates that the ideas of Avicenna on the subject of love are similar to those of Courtly Love, but he presents no concrete evidence of any connection between them. The works of Andreas and Chrétien de Troyes can be satisfactorily, to this reviewer's mind more satisfactorily, explained in other ways. But the subject is a fascinating one and new suggestions are always welcome especially when they are expressed with the verve and brevity that mark this little book.

SIDNEY PAINTER

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*Early Dutch librettos and plays with music in the British Museum.* By ALFRED LOEWENBERG. Reprinted from the *Journal of Documentation*, March, 1947. London, Aslib, 1947, Pp. 30. The British Museum has published no counterpart to the invaluable *Catalogue of opera librettos printed before 1800*, prepared by O. G. T. Sonneck for the Library of Congress. As a specimen section of such a project Alfred Loewenberg has put forth a pamphlet entitled as above. In the introductory note the author observes the "curious fact that Holland, a country with a great musical and theatrical tradition, was very nearly bypassed by the operatic tide, which, starting from Italy, swept all Europe." There were few native composers, and operas of foreign, chiefly French origin predominated. At first glance the catalogue seems to soften this assertion. Of 97 titles about 43 are of Dutch and 43 of French origin, but on closer inspection a large number of the purely Dutch entries prove to represent single celebrations of royal marriages, arrivals of kings, signings of peace or other events of state. As might be expected, the librettos of the operas of French origin go back chiefly to Anseaume, Chamfort, Favart, Lourdé de Santerre, Marmontel, Quétant, Quinault, and Sedaine. *Lucile* is attributed properly to Marmontel, who was entitled to some recognition also under (6) *Annette en Lubin* and (84) *De Toets der Vriendschap*. The arrangement in general parallels Sonneck's catalogue. The descriptive comments are based on painstaking and thorough research. It is to be hoped that this modest beginning may speed the development of a completed whole.

LAWRENCE M. PRICE

*University of California*

---

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume LXIII

JUNE, 1948

Number 6

---

## THE MEANING OF "AT ERST": PROLOGUE TO "SIR THOPAS," B<sup>2</sup>, 1884

Whan seyde was al this myracle euery man  
As sobre was that wonder was to se  
Til that oure hoost iapen to bigan  
And thanne at erst he looked vp on me  
And seyde thus. . .<sup>1</sup>

Students of Chaucer's Prologue to "Sir Thopas"<sup>2</sup> have already become thoroughly aware of the first three lines of this passage, which would seem to state that the entire company of Canterbury Pilgrims has come under the spell of the Prioress' account of the miracle of Our Lady, a solemn spell which remains unbroken until "oure hoost iapen to bigan." The line which follows, "And thanne at erst he looked vp on me," constitutes a puzzle, for "at erst" is commonly read "at first." As a result, the reader must decide between two unsatisfactory interpretations: "And then, as the first butt for his joking, the Host looked at me,"<sup>3</sup> or "And then for the first time he looked at me."<sup>4</sup> The first of these interpretations is not likely (1) because Chaucer's word choice and order make it improbable (the Host *began* to jest, *and then* he looked at Chaucer); (2) because later lines indicate that the Host was surrounded by his

<sup>1</sup> John M. Manly and Edith Rickert, *The Text of The Canterbury Tales* (1940), iv, 139; B<sup>2</sup>, 1881-1885. [Unless otherwise indicated, all quoted lines from *The Canterbury Tales* are from Manly and Rickert, and all quoted lines from Chaucer's other works are from F. N. Robinson's *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (1933).]

<sup>2</sup> Headed by Thomas A. Knott in his "A Bit of Chaucer Mythology," *MP*, viii (1910), 135-139.

<sup>3</sup> Knott, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

<sup>4</sup> See the renderings of this line in the translations of *The Canterbury Tales* by MacKaye and Tatlock and J. U. Nicolson.

own group (with whom, naturally, he would have begun his jests) and had actually to call Chaucer to him ("Approche neer and looke vp myrily," B<sup>2</sup>, 1888), and (3) because it becomes immediately apparent that Chaucer has been selected as the teller of the next tale and therefore is not the first butt for the Host's jests but the last.

The second interpretation, "And then for the first time he looked at me," is ambiguous, for it leaves the obvious question unanswered: first since when? If it is taken to mean "first since he decided to raise the party's spirits," the objections already made hold good. If it is taken to mean "first since the beginning of the pilgrimage," the translator must assume that Chaucer here evidences traits very different from those shown by his genial manner in the "General Prologue" (30-32).

This puzzle can be solved if "thanne at erst" is taken to mean "then and not sooner," "then—and not until then," "only then," or simply "then." The passage can then be interpreted thus: the Canterbury party is solemn and quiet after the Prioress ends her "Tale"; the Host, who prefers jollity, tries to break the spell by jesting with the company at large; *then*, having (presumably) made sufficient progress in his effort to set the stage for another story, he turns his attention to Chaucer and addresses "Murye Wordes"<sup>5</sup> to him.

I shall attempt to show in this note (1) that there is dictionary justification for reading "thanne at erst" as "then and not sooner" and (2) that the rendering "then and not sooner," "then—and not until then," "only then," or "then" for "thanne at erst" makes for a plausible and more logical interpretation of Chaucer's text not only in this passage from the Prologue to "Sir Thopas" but in every instance in Chaucer in which the phrase occurs.

Of the 43 instances in which the word "erst(e)" is used by Chaucer, 31 show its occurrence in an isolated position, that is, not preceded by the preposition "at(te)."<sup>6</sup> In this situation "first" may be the suitable reading for the word, but it is to be noted that authorities give a variety of meanings from which the

<sup>5</sup> Subtitle to the Prologue to "Sir Thopas" "Bihoold the Murye Wordes of the Hoost to Chaucer;" Manly, *Text*, iv, 139.

<sup>6</sup> John S. P. Tatlock and Arthur G. Kennedy, *A Concordance to the Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (1927); s. v. *erst*, p. 274.

reader or translator is to make a choice.<sup>7</sup> But when we examine the 12 instances in which the word "erst(e)" occurs as a part of the phrase "at(te) erst(e)" [eight times as "than(ne) (then) at(te) erst(e)," four times as "now at(te) erst(e)"], we find that Chaucer scholars and translators have adhered closely to the literal translation, "then (now) at first," recognizing neither the latitude they permit for the word "erst" alone nor the necessity for a different reading. Robinson, in the glossary to his edition of *Chaucer's Complete Works*, lists no translation for "at erst," merely labelling it "dat. phr." Skeat, in the glossarial index to his edition of *Chaucer's Complete Works*, lists for "at erst" only the meanings "first" and "for the first time" (with one notable exception which will be discussed below). The *NED*, however, in its second definition (A 2) for "erst," offers solid ground for an altered reading. The definition follows: "Absol. in advb. phrases. Now (then) at erst: now (then) and not sooner, cf. Ger. *erst dann*." (*Erst dann* has the meaning of "only then" or "then—and not until then," implying connotatively that the preceding action is not necessarily complete.)

Thus, according to the *NED* definition, the line "And thanne at erst he looked vp on me" in the Prologue to "Sir Thopas" would mean "And then (and not sooner) he (our Host) looked at me." The Host had by his jesting dispelled much of the sobriety resulting from the Prioress' "Tale," and then he looked to Chaucer as the teller of the next tale.

Let us now see whether the other 11 occurrences of "Than(ne) (now) at(te) erst(e)" bear out this reading.

In the "Second Nun's Tale," quoted by *NED* as an illustration of the definition given above, occurs the line: "And thanne at erst thus to him sayde sche" (G 151), an exact parallel to the line from the Prologue to "Sir Thopas" in so far as the phrase in question is concerned. Cecilia demands that Valerian take an oath not to

<sup>7</sup> The *New English Dictionary* (III) lists eight major variations in meaning for "erst," ranging from "first in time or serial order" through "not long ago" and "a little while since." Robinson, in the glossary to his edition of *Chaucer's Complete Works*, defines "erst" as "first, at first; before." Walter W. Skeat, in his *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language* (Oxford. 1888), defines "erst" as "soonest, first," and in the glossarial index to his edition of *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Oxford. 1894) as "first, at first; before; aforetime."

Four further occurrences of the phrase "at(te) erst(e)" serve also to illustrate the logic of such translation:

(1) In the "Clerk's Tale," Walter has cast off Griselda and has announced that he is bringing a younger woman to court to be his bride. His subjects, pitying Griselda, object; but Walter brings the girl before them,

For which the peple ran to seen the sighte  
Of hire array so richely biseye  
And thanne at erst amonges hem they seye  
That Walter was no fool. . . .

(E, Cl, 983-986.)

The people see the maiden, "And then (and not until then) do they say among themselves that Walter was no fool."

(2) In "The House of Fame" (511-517) Chaucer says,

And listeneth of my drem to lere.  
For now at erste shul ye here  
So sely an avisyon,  
That Isaye, ne Scipion,  
Ne king Nabugodonosor,  
Pharoo, Turnus, ne Elcanor,  
Ne mette such a drem as this'

Listen to my dream . . . for now (only now) shall you hear . . .

(3) In "The Legend of Good Women" (2106-2108), Theseus tells Ariadne:

. if I hadde knyf or spere,  
I wolde it laten out, and theron swere,  
For thanne at erst I wot ye wole me leve.'

If I had knife or spear, I would . . . swear on it, for then (and not until then) I know . . .

(4) After an introductory passage in *The Romaunt of the Rose*, Chaucer writes (7171-7172):

But now at erst I wole bigynne  
To expowne you the pith withynne —

But now (and not sooner, only now) I will begin . . .

That the phrase "at erst" is close to our modern "at last" is apparent in some of the quotations already cited [notably E, Cl., 983-986, which could be read quite logically "And then at last

among themselves they said that Walter was no fool;” G 264, which could be read “But now at last in truth our dwelling is,” HF 512, which could be read “For now at last you shall hear,” and RR 7171, “But now at last (or finally) I will begin”]. This reading of “at last” for “at erst” may be justified in some instances, particularly in a free translation, on three major counts: (1) the etymology of the Germanic word “erst,” (2) a translation of “at erst” as “at last” by Skeat, and (3) five occurrences of “at last” in place of “at erst” in manuscript variants.

“Erst,” even without a preceding preposition, can carry the meaning “last.” According to Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, concepts of the first and the last (*primum* and *demum*) have so merged that “erst” can be valid for both.<sup>8</sup> *Erst jetzt versteh ichs* is translated by the Grimms as *nunc demum intelligo*, which may be rendered into English as “Now at last I understand.”<sup>9</sup>

Skeat, in his glossarial index, after giving the customary translation of “erst” as “first” and “at first” and after translating the phrase “at erst” as “first” or “for the first time,” with the six references noted above, makes one specific exception: referring to the line “For thou art wrooth, ye, now at erst I see” (*Troilus and Criseyde*, I, 842), he defines “at erst” as “at last.” Neither with his definition nor in his notes to any of the lines listed in connection with “at erst” does Skeat explain the opposed meanings; nor does he tell why “at last” is selected as the translation for “at erst” in one line and not in other lines which it would seem to suit equally well.

That the reading “at last” occurred in Chaucer’s time (or in the time of his scribes) is shown by five textual variants in the Chaucer manuscripts:

- (1) In one of the lines already quoted from the “Second Nun’s

<sup>8</sup> “da aber begriffe des anfangs und endes sich mischen, *ende* sowol das obere als untere ist, *ort* den anfang und die spitze bedeutet, laufen auch *primum* und *demum* in einander, und unser *erst* kann für beide gelten. nähere bestimmungen treten noch durch das verbum oder durch andere partikeln zu, die eben so oft gesetzt werden, als auch wegfallen, bisweilen bleibt der sinn zweifelhaft oder mehrdeutig.” [Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (Leipzig: 1862), III, 990-991.]

<sup>9</sup> Among numerous meanings for *demum*, Harper’s *A New Latin Dictionary* (New York: 1907) lists “not till, now at length, at last, finally; not till then, just precisely, only.”



Tale" ("And thanne at erst thus to him sayde sche"), "at erst" appears in the Harley 1758 manuscript as "at þe last"<sup>10</sup>

(2) In the same line, exactly the same variation occurs in the Glasgow manuscript.<sup>11</sup>

(3) Again in the same line, the phrase appears in the Harley 7333 manuscript as "at lest."<sup>12</sup> ("Lest," according to the *NED*, is an obsolete form of "last.")

(4) In a second quotation from the "Second Nun's Tale," "But now at erst in trouthe oure dwelling is," "at erst" appears in the Glasgow manuscript as the eminently more logical "at þe last."<sup>13</sup>

(5) In the fourth line of the Prologue to "Sir Thopas," the Philipps 8136 manuscript has the phrase "at last" for "at erst."<sup>14</sup>

It would seem, then, that a reconsideration of the translation of the phrase "than(ne) (now) at(te) erst(e)" is in order for each of the 12 occasions in which it occurs in Chaucer's works. One literal and logical translation, which has dictionary and etymological support, is "then (now) and not sooner," which may be varied to read "then (now)—and not until then (now)," "only then (now)," or "then (now)," without altering the essential meaning. A further and freer translation, with support in etymology, from Skeat, and in textual variants—"at last"—may be considered in specific instances.

In connection with the "Sir Thopas" prologue, the altered translation clears an ambiguity that has been perpetuated by Knott, Tatlock and MacKaye, Skeat, Robinson, Nicolson, and others. If the fourth line, "And thanne at erst he looked vp on me," is rendered as "And then (and not until then) did he look at me," it becomes clear (with the context) that the Host has begun his joking and has dispelled at least a great part of the sobriety resulting from the Prioress' "Tale" *before* he addresses his merry words to Chaucer, who is thereby selected as the teller of the next tale.

JOSEPH P. ROFFOLO

*Tulane University*

<sup>10</sup> Manly, *Text*, VIII, 19.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII, 29.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, VII, 182.

### THE FEIGNED ILLNESS IN CHAUCER'S *TROILUS AND CRISEYDE*

The brilliant scene at the house of Deiphebus in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*<sup>1</sup> is one of the author's principal additions to the story told by Boccaccio in *Il Filostrato*. In it, Pandarus, through the use of a set of cunning stratagems, brings about the first interview between the lovers. This meeting culminates in their first embrace, and is a significant step in the progress of the love affair towards its consummation. It marks Criseyde's outright acceptance of Troilus as her servant in love,<sup>2</sup> and above all, it introduces the bedside décor which is to figure so largely later.

Much of the success of Pandarus' design depends on Troilus' feigned illness. On the suggestion of his friend, Troilus pretends to have a fever, and goes to bed in his brother's house. Not only does this stratagem serve to hide from the world his actual love-sickness, but it also makes a private interview with Criseyde possible, and justifiable to the others. Since Troilus is unable to join the company, Criseyde must come to him to solicit his aid in her supposed plight. Her companions, Deiphebus and Helen, having left the sick man's room to discuss matters of state elsewhere, Criseyde finds herself alone with Troilus and Pandarus, and is promptly brought around to the business of love.

Scholarship has produced no promising suggestions concerning the origin of this scene, and it is usually considered to be wholly Chaucer's invention.<sup>3</sup> It is interesting, therefore, to note that there is a rough but striking parallel to the feigned illness motif of this episode in the violent and tragic Biblical story of Amnon and Tamar (*II Samuel* 13: 1-20). The Vulgate version (*Liber II Regum*), up to the rape of Tamar, runs as follows:

Factum est autem post haec, ut Absalom filii David sororem speciosissimam, vocabulo Thamar, adamaret Amnon filius David, et deperiret eam valde, ita ut propter amorem eius aegrotaret: quia cum esset virgo, difficile ei vide-

<sup>1</sup> R. K. Root, ed., *The Book of Troilus and Criseyde by Geoffrey Chaucer*, Princeton, 1945, II. 1541-III. 231

<sup>2</sup> *Idem*, III. 159 ff.

<sup>3</sup> See F. N. Robinson, ed., *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Boston, 1933, note to *Troilus and Criseyde*, II. 1394-1757, p. 933; Root, *op. cit.*, xxix.

batur ut quippiam inhoneste ageret cum ea. Erat autem Amnon amicus, nomine Jonadab, filius Semaa fratris David, vir prudens valde Qui dixit ad eum. Quare sic attenuaris macie fili regis per singulos dies? cur non indicas mihi? Dixitque ei Amnon Thamar sororem fratris mei Absalom amo. Cui respondit Jonadab: Cuba super lectum tuum, et languorem simula. cumque venerit pater tuus ut visitet te, dic ei: Veniat, oro, Thamar soror mea, ut det mihi cibum, et faciat pulmentum ut comedam de manu eius Accubuit itaque Amnon, et quasi aegrotare coepit. cumque venisset rex ad visitandum eum, ait Amnon ad regem. Veniat, obsecro, Thamar soror mea, ut faciat in oculis meis duas sorbitiunculas, et cibum capiam de manu eius. Misit ergo David ad Thamar domum, dicens Veni in domum Amnon fratris tui, et fac ei pulmentum. Venitque Thamar in domum Amnon fratris sui ille autem jacebat quae tollens farinam commiscuit: et liquefaciens, in oculis eius coxit sorbitiunculas. Tollensque quod coxerat, effudit, et posuit coram eo, et noluit comedere. dixitque Amnon: Ejicite universos a me. Cumque ejecissent omnes, dixit Amnon ad Thamar Infer cibum in conclave, ut vescar de manu tua. Tulit ergo Thamar sorbitiunculas, quas fecerat, et intulit ad Amnon fratrem suum in conclave Cumque obtulisset ei cibum, apprehendit eam, et ait Veni, cuba mecum soror mea. Quae respondit ei Noli frater mi, noli opprimere me, neque enim hoc fas est in Israel: noli facere stultitiam hanc Noluit autem acquiescere precibus eius, sed praevalens viribus oppressit eam, et cubavit cum ea.

Although the conclusions of the two stories are somewhat different in spirit, and the family relationships of the characters do not correspond, the circumstances which lead to the stratagem are highly similar, and suggest the possibility that Chaucer found in the bare Biblical narrative a suggestion for his admirable and complicated scene.

Aside from those in the Latin and French Bibles, medieval versions of the story are not numerous. It does appear, however, in Peter Comestor's *Historia Scholastica*,<sup>4</sup> with minor variations from the Vulgate, and in Flavius Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*. The Latin translation of the latter,<sup>5</sup> commonly ascribed to Rufinus but probably written in the sixth century through the agency of Cassiodorus, was quite popular during the middle ages,<sup>6</sup> and was

<sup>4</sup> J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologia Latina*, 221 vols., Paris, 1844-65, cxcviii, 1334-1335.

<sup>5</sup> *Flavii Iosephi Antiquitatum Iudaicarum Libri XX*. The story appears in vii. viii, pp. 196-197 of the Basle edition of 1524, from which I quote. According to Emil Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, 1st div., 2 vols., New York, 1891, i, 102, this is the best of the old Latin texts of Josephus' *Opera*.

<sup>6</sup> See Leslie W. Jones, "The Influence of Cassiodorus on Mediaeval

used by Comestor himself. No single version contains pertinent elements which are exclusive to itself, but the Latin *Josephus* is the most interesting, since several details in it appear in a form more circumstantial than that of the others.

That Chaucer used the Vulgate from time to time is fairly certain.<sup>7</sup> His knowledge of Josephus has not been investigated, though the historian stands on the first pillar in Chaucer's *House of Fame*.

Alderfirst, loo, ther I sigh  
Upon a piler stonde on high,  
...  
The Ebrayk Josephus, the olde,  
That of Jewes gestes tolde;  
And he bar on his shuldres hye  
The fame up of the Jewerye  
And by him stoden other sevene,  
Wise and worthy for to nevene,  
To helpen him bere up the charge,  
Hyt was so hevy and so large.  
And for they writen of batayles,  
As wel as other olde mervayles . . . (1429-1442)

It is possible, of course, that Josephus was known to Chaucer only by reputation.<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, the remarkable prominence given him here may indicate actual reading acquaintance with his works, though possibly not with *Antiquities*. The *Jewish War* of Josephus, which also existed in Latin translation, could alone, for instance, have produced Chaucer's comments.

In the following analysis I shall quote those passages from Josephus which appear to be closer than the Vulgate to Chaucer. Comestor's borrowings from Josephus here do not involve the important details. His version is shorter and generally less satisfactory than that of the Vulgate.

Culture," *Speculum* 20 (1945), 441; Schurer, *op. cit.*, I, 99. A list of mss., some of which contain the *Antiquitates*, will be found in the preface to Josephus' *De Iudaeorum Vetustate sive Contra Apionem*, ed. C. Boysen, Vienna, 1898.

<sup>7</sup> See Grace W. Landrum, "Chaucer's Use of the Vulgate," *PMLA* 39 (1924), 75-100.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. John Gower, *Confessio Amantis*, iv. 2140 ff., where Josephus is listed among "The ferste . . . of Enditours,/ Of old Cronique;" and a less fanciful list in the *proemium* of Godfrey of Viterbo's *Pantheon*, ed. Migne, *op. cit.*, cxcviii, 878.

In the events which lead to the stratagem, there are several striking similarities between Chaucer and the Bible story:

1. The basic group of characters is the same. There are the lover (Troilus. Amnon), his trusted friend (Pandarus Jonadab),<sup>9</sup> the beautiful woman (Criseyde: Tamar), and the innocent visitors (Deiphobus, Helen: David).

2. In each story the lover is the king's son, and is so desperately in love that he becomes ill. At the same time, he is unable to do anything to help himself and his suffering causes a marked change in his appearance. On this point Josephus is more detailed than Comestor or the Vulgate. Whereas the latter mention Amnon's illness in a word or two, Josephus has *crudeli percussus vulnere carpebatur. Dumque eius corpus interiori languore tabesceret, et iam colorem macies permutaret. . . .*

3. In both stories the friend notices the lover's change of appearance, comes in upon him, and asks the cause of his illness. The lover confides in him. Here again Josephus is fuller than the others,<sup>10</sup> Jonadab even venturing to suggest that his friend is in the toils of love: *dicebatque arbitrari se haec illum amoris occasione perferre*. In Chaucer's narrative there are two versions of this interview. The first,<sup>11</sup> told in the third person, says nothing of Pandarus' knowledge of the cause of Troilus' state, although it is implied by Pandarus' deliberate mistakes<sup>12</sup> that he does not believe the trouble to lie in political or religious matters. In Pandarus' subsequent account to Criseyde,<sup>13</sup> if we can take it literally, he has already overheard the hero's love-complaint before the interview. Here he again makes a deliberate mistake,<sup>14</sup> but one based on a clear suspicion of the truth.

4. The friend in both stories is characterized by his intellectual

<sup>9</sup> In some of the early editions of the Latin *Josephus* he is called Jonathe or Jonathan, following the original Greek

<sup>10</sup> Comestor adds to Jonadab's question *Quasi diceret: qui debes succedere regi in regnum*, but this consideration does not appear in the interview between Troilus and Pandarus.

<sup>11</sup> *Troilus and Criseyde*, II. 457 ff.

<sup>12</sup> *Idem*, II. 553 ff.: 'Han now thus soone Grekes maad yow leene?/ Or hastow som remors of conscience,/ And art now falle in som devocoun . . . ?'

<sup>13</sup> *Idem*, II. 504 ff.

<sup>14</sup> *Idem*, II. 546: 'It semeth nat that love doth yow longe'

powers. In the Vulgate he is *vir prudens valde*, but in Josephus he comes closer to Pandarus: *vir . . . sapiens, et intellectu nimis acutus*.

It will be obvious to the reader that most of the details mentioned above came to Chaucer from Boccaccio and are recognizable aspects of the courtly-love romance. But the similarity between the stories is such, that if Chaucer had known the Amnon and Tamar story it may have become associated in his mind with that of Troilus and Criseyde. On the strength of this association, then, he may have added to his narrative the stratagem of feigned illness which appears in the Bible tale but not in Boccaccio. In both the Bible and Chaucer, the friend advises the lover to pretend to be ill and to go to bed. In Josephus' version is added an explicit promise of relief: *quod si fieret, privaretur citius a languore*.

The privacy and consideration accorded to ill persons are heavily insisted upon by Chaucer in the scene, and they appear likewise in the Bible. In the Vulgate version, Amnon thus prevails upon his visiting father to send Tamar to him, then, taking control of the situation, he simply sends everyone away. In Josephus there is more of an element of deception. He has his servants keep everyone away from the house, more clearly capitalizing on his feigned illness: *ut quasi quiete facta dormiret*. There may be a reminiscence of this in Pandarus' admonition:

'alle folk, for goddes love, I preye,  
Stynteth right here, and softly yow pleye,' (II, 1728 f.)

and in Troilus' behavior after the love-scene:

And of Eleyne and hym he wolde feyn  
Delivered ben, and seyde that hym leste  
To slepe, and after tales have reste. (III 222 ff.)

If Chaucer was indeed indebted to some version of the Amnon and Tamar story for this scene, it would be difficult to overestimate the skill of his adaptation, for there are psychological and causal threads binding it securely to the rest of the poem. In particular, there is an anticipation of the feigned illness motif in Troilus' behavior as described in Book I:

And fro this forth tho reffe hym love his slepe,  
And made his mete his foo, and ek his sorwe  
Gan multiplie, that, whoso tok kepe,

It shewed in his hewe, on eve and morwe;  
 Therfor tith he gan him for to borwe  
 Of other siknesse, lest men of hym wende,  
 That the hote fir of love hym brende . . . (I 484 ff.)

This detail does not appear in Boccaccio, where, indeed, Troilus uses the opposite type of concealment.<sup>15</sup> Later, when Pandarus suggests the trick with every appearance of its being his own idea,<sup>16</sup> Troilus realistically replies

'twis, thow nedeles  
 Conseilest me, that siklich I me feyne,  
 For I am sik in ernest, douteles, . . . ' (II. 1527 ff.)

Thus Chaucer combines the elements of secrecy and real illness, which have been stressed throughout the poem, with the demands of the stratagem itself, by this combination making the latter seem all the more natural and indigenous.

In terms of movement, however, the scene is easily the most complicated in Chaucer's poems. In it he must keep continually in mind at least four different points of view. The reader and Pandarus know all. To Deiphebus' guests it must appear that Criseyde sees Troilus in the company of Deiphebus and Helen. The latter, however, do not know how long Criseyde has been in the room, and they suspect none of the trickery. Finally, there is the viewpoint of the heroine herself, with the ambiguous mixture of knowledge and innocence so characteristic of her. The sum of these produces a scene that would rival a detective story in its complicated manipulation of the comings and goings of characters.

Chaucer needed a scene in which to bring the lovers closer together. Although it also makes a brilliant contribution to the characterization of Pandarus, one wonders whether, had Chaucer relied on his unaided imagination, he would have adopted a solution so involved and difficult as this. It is perhaps more likely that he received a hint from some outside source, and, recognizing its aptness, set about to solve the problems of adaptation magnificently.

CHARLES MUSCATINE

*University of California*

<sup>15</sup> *The Filostrato of Giovanni Boccaccio*, ed. and trans. N. E. Griffin and A. B. Myrick, Philadelphia, 1929, Part I, st. 47. *Come che egli il recuo-prusse molto/ Con riso infinto e con parlar sincero*, "with feigned smile," etc.

<sup>16</sup> *Troilus and Criseyde*, II. 1511-1512.

RAPE AND WOMAN'S SOVEREIGNTY IN THE  
WIFE OF BATH'S TALE

Of the close analogues to the *Wife of Bath's Tale*, none makes rape the fundamental cause for setting the riddle, "what do women most desire?" This marks off Chaucer's version from the others including Gower's *Tale of Florent*.<sup>1</sup> Again such examples of rape in Medieval story as appear<sup>2</sup> seem too far from the story represented by the *Wife's Tale* and its analogues to offer a satisfactory explanation for Chaucer's use of rape as the motivation for setting the riddle. These facts would suggest that Chaucer may himself have originated this change and that his reasons for so doing may be found only in the artistic purposes of the *Tale* itself.

How brilliantly Chaucer has constructed the *Tale* has been pointed out. Very obvious as compared with the analogues is, for example, the structural improvement in Chaucer's delaying both the solution to the riddle and the demand for marriage by the loathly lady. Of more importance, Professor Coffman<sup>3</sup> and Professor Schlauch<sup>4</sup> have shown that Chaucer made use both of courtly love and of anti-feminist literature in constructing the tale. There could hardly be more contrasting materials, and yet both scholars have demonstrated that Chaucer's use of these materials in the tale served to tighten its structure. Chaucer's use of the rape motif, as this paper hopes to show, is a still further indication of the structural perfection of the *Wife of Bath's Tale*.

<sup>1</sup> The standard works on the sources and analogues remain G. H. Maynard's *The Wife of Bath's Tale* (London, 1901) and Miss Laura Sumner's introduction to her edition of *The Weddyng of Sir Gawayn and Dame Ragnell* (Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, v, No. 4, 1924). For the materials see Bartlett J. Whiting, "The Wife of Bath's Tale," *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales* (Chicago, 1941).

<sup>2</sup> For example, stories of the demon lover (the *incubus* alluded to by the Wife of Bath in her fling at the friar); stories such as those featured in the ballad, *The Knight and the Shepherd's Daughter* (Mayndier, *op. cit.*, 111 ff.); a type of the French pastoral; classical stories of rape as in the *Legend of Good Women*.

<sup>3</sup> G. R. Coffman, "Chaucer and Courtly Love Once More—The Wife of Bath's Tale," *Speculum*, xx (1945), 43-48.

<sup>4</sup> Margaret Schlauch, "The Marital Dilemma in the *Wife of Bath's Tale*," *PMLA* lxi (1946), 416-430. Both these studies are indispensable for a proper understanding of the Tale; no purpose would be served here in summarizing their findings.



In the *Wife's Tale*, the hero commits rape, is sentenced to death by the existing law of the land, is saved by the Queen who then sets the riddle to the knight: "what do women most desire?" Curiously Chaucer's version involves the setting of the riddle by one who has befriended the knight. On the surface, this would appear to be a weakening of an already vague motivation: actually when properly understood it reveals the basic framework of Chaucer's tale.

We must first enquire as to the status of the raped woman: peasant or lady? We cannot hope to find the answer to that in any of the various rape-motifs, but Chaucer's lines themselves suggest that it is a peasant woman: the "mayde" is walking alone by the river when she is attacked. Because of the rape a great "clamour" and "pursute" is made "unto Kyng Arthour" This is not a description of a nobleman's protest over the rape of his daughter, but the angry outcry of outraged villagers (an angry pursuit is common in the pastoral). The natural supposition, then, would be that it was a peasant girl who was raped. This is reinforced if we ask the question as to why the Queen protected the guilty knight; it is *only* if we assume that no lady of noble birth was involved that we can possibly explain such conduct. If a noble lady had been attacked the Queen's conduct would have been most outrageous; clearly she was not motivated by the desire to avenge an affront: in that case she would simply have allowed the law of the land to exact the extreme penalty.

Only if a peasant girl is involved may the Queen's action be explained, and explained, it seems to me, in an entirely satisfactory manner. What in fact the Queen does is to claim the knight as under the jurisdiction of her court—the Court of Love. She appeals, figuratively, to the cloth. By the "statut" of Arthur's realm, the young man had committed a crime, punishable by death. In the law of the Courts of Love he had committed at the most an indiscretion. Andreas Capellanus makes this point clear in the Chapter, *De Amore Rusticorum*.<sup>5</sup> He advises against any love affairs with peasant girls, but suggests that if a young man is over-

<sup>5</sup> Professor Coffman (p. 46) has suggested the applicability of this chapter, he does not consider it to have any very great significance. It might be pointed out that my study of the Wife of Bath's Tale in the light of the traditions of courtly love was not suggested by Professor Coffman's article but was made separately.

come by attraction, he had best be brutally abrupt and where persuasion fails have recourse to rape:

Si vero et illarum te feminarum amor forte attraxerit, eas pluribus laudibus efferre memento, et, si locum inveneris opportunum, non differas assumere, quod petebas et violento potiri amplexu. Vix enim ipsarum in tantum exterius poteris mitigare rigorem, quod quietos fateantur se tibi concessuras, amplexus vel optata patiantur te habere solatia, nisi modicae saltem coactionis medela praecedat ipsarum opportuna pudoris

He concludes with the warning that this is not intended as an encouragement to such affairs with peasant girls; but simply that the courtly gentleman may know the proper "doctrine":

Haec autem dicimus non quasi rusticanarum mulierum tibi svadere volentes amorem, sed ut, si minus provide ad illas provoceris amandum, brevi possis doctrina cognoscere, quis tibi sit processus habendus<sup>6</sup>

Here must be the explanation for the Queen's action—she is protecting—as a great lady of Love—a young knight from a law which is not applicable to him if he is of *her* court. She appeals to the higher law of the God of Love!

But the Queen points out to the knight "Thou standest yet . . . in swich array that of thy lyf yet hastow no suretee." Rape—even of a peasant girl—is not praiseworthy: It is behavior which, though excusable, is a violation of the courtly principle of measure.<sup>7</sup> A problem, in fact, remains. Is the conduct of the knight actually excusable or is it perhaps symptomatic of a deep-seated failure to understand the basic principle of Courtly Love, the sovereignty of women? Was he fully aware of the "doctrine" in raping the girl? Was he making the proper distinction between lady and animal? This is Chaucer's subtle motivation for the setting of the riddle, the purpose of which is to ascertain if the young man understood that women were sovereign. The Court of Love to be convoked in a year would consider his answer.

Of course, the knight does not himself find the right answer; it is supplied to him by the loathly lady. He technically satisfies the Court of Love; in actuality the problem of his inner conviction

<sup>6</sup> *Andrae Capellani regis Francorum de Amore*, libri tres, edited by Amadeo Pages (Castellon de la Plana, 1930), 120.

<sup>7</sup> Cp. *Legend of Good Women*, 165-166; *Book of the Duchess*, 881-882. Cf. G. Paré, *Le Roman de la Rose et la Scolastique Courtoise*, Ottawa, 1941, 141-144.

is still unsettled. That is why in the logic of the Wife's exemplum the setting of the dilemma by the loathly lady becomes necessary; when the knight asks her to make the choice—when he admits from within himself the sovereignty of women—then and only then is he truly blessed—and the lady is revealed in all her charms. With logical precision the Wife of Bath demonstrates her fundamental thesis, her thesis and ironically the thesis of courtly love: women are sovereign. Not only has Chaucer interwoven in the story the diverse threads of traditional anti-feminist literature, and of the literature of courtly love, but he has made a logical sequence of the two patched-together stories of the riddle and the dilemma; in Chaucer's story both become aspects of one fundamental test, that of the lover's true understanding of the necessity of obedience to woman. The Wife of Bath could well have affixed the Q. E. D.

BERNARD F. HUPPÉ

*Princeton University*

---

### THE WIFE OF BATH'S HAT

Professor J. M. Manly asserts " (The Wife of Bath) still wore the coverchief, or kerchief, which had not been 'in style' since the middle of the century."<sup>1</sup> This conclusion, based<sup>2</sup> upon specific illustrations of "heavy head-dress,"<sup>3</sup> is questionable since these particular illustrations portray fifteenth century fashions.

Moreover, there is evidence showing that kerchiefs were in style well past the middle of the fourteenth century,<sup>4</sup>—a point of little importance since, in all probability, the Wife's coverchief was not a kerchief at all. In describing her head-dress Chaucer exclaims, "I dorste swere they weyeden ten pound,"<sup>5</sup> and kerchiefs, all evidence suggests, were not that heavy. It is true that the words,

<sup>1</sup> John Matthews Manly, *Some New Light on Chaucer*, pp. 230-31.

<sup>2</sup> F. N. Robinson, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, p. 764.

<sup>3</sup> F. W. Fairholt, *Costume in England*, I, figs. 125, 129, 130, 151.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Iris Brooke, *English Costume of the Late Middle Ages*, pp. 17-28, passim; Fairholt, *op. cit.*, Fig. 83, p. 108; Margaret Rule, *Details and Accessories of Historical Costumes from the 14th through the 18th Centuries*, vol. I, Plate x, Fig. 50; Plate xiv, Fig. 73; Plate xvii, Figs. 89, 90, 91; Plate xviii, Fig. 92.

<sup>5</sup> Chaucer, *General Prologue*, l. 454.

coverchief and kerchief, were usually synonymous; but in this case, the broader definition, head-dress, or hat,<sup>6</sup> is more applicable

Furthermore, neither the coverchiefs "that on a Sondag weren upon hir heed"<sup>7</sup> nor the hat which she wore on the pilgrimage was to be fashionable until Anne of Bohemia was crowned Queen of England in 1382. "Anne brought with her a variety of previously unknown ideas regarding clothes, the most important being the gigantic and ornate head-dresses, which were worn throughout the following century, increasing in size as the century advanced"<sup>8</sup> Not until after Anne's arrival in England were head-dresses popular which, even allowing for exaggeration on the part of Chaucer, could have been described as weighing ten pounds or "as brood as a bokeler or a targe."<sup>9</sup>

The Wife of Bath was not thirty-five or more years out of style; she was, rather, very much in style in her choice of hats

DALE E. WRETTLIND

*State University of Iowa*

---

#### AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER OF JOHANN ADOLF SCHLEGEL

Letters of German literary men belonging to the generation of Lessing have long been rare and difficult to obtain, even in Europe. The recent discovery of such a letter in America is therefore a most unusual event. It was purchased not long ago in New York from the Argosy Book Stores, is written on the four sides of a large folded quarto sheet, and is from the pen of Johann Adolf Schlegel, the father of the famous romanticists, August Wilhelm and Friedrich. As lately as 1934 it was not known to Dr. Wilhelm Frels, who failed to mention it in his *Deutsche Dichterhandschriften von 1400 bis 1900*. A search in the available reference works and in the

<sup>6</sup> J. A. H. Murray, *New English Dictionary*, II, Part II, Comm-Czech, p. 1105.

<sup>7</sup> Chaucer, *op. cit.*, l. 455.

<sup>8</sup> Brooke, *op. cit.*, p. 28; cf. Henry Shaw, *Dresses and Decorations of the Middle Ages*, vol. 1, Introduction; Dion Clayton Calthrop, *English Costume*, p. 136.

<sup>9</sup> Chaucer, *op. cit.*, l. 471.

*Jahresberichte* has furnished no clue which would indicate previous publication.

The following data are necessary for a better understanding of the letter. Its writer, Johann Adolf, one of thirteen children of Johann Friedrich Schlegel, was born in September, 1721, in Meissen. The most famous of his brothers was Johann Elias, and less well known were Johann Heinrich and Johann August. The last-named, who is mentioned in our letter, died in 1776, about two years after the date of the letter, as pastor in Rehburg, in Hannover. In 1741 Johann Adolf was sent to Leipzig to study theology. There he met Gellert, then already famous, who was at first cold to him but whose warm friendship he soon won. Through the influence of K. C. Gartner, Schlegel joined the staff of the so-called *Bremer Beytrage* and was thus brought into close contact with J. A. Cramer, who was destined to become the first biographer of Gellert (1774). Schlegel continued contributing to the *Beytrage* until 1748, three years after leaving Leipzig. He lived for a while in the late forties with Cramer, when the latter was pastor in Crellwitz. In 1751 Schlegel held a theological position in Pforta, and it was there that he married the daughter of the mathematician Hubsch. As pastor in Zerbst (1754) his eloquence made him famous and led to his call to the pastorate of the Marktkirche in the city of Hannover, where he remained from 1759 until his death. Prior to going to Hannover he had turned down a professorship of theology in Gottingen. In 1775 he became "Consistorialrath" and was later showered with other high positions and honors. During his last years he wrote hymns on the model of Gellert's. He died on September 16, 1793. The Johann Adolf Schlegels had ten children, eight sons and two daughters. Four sons died before their father, but Karl August Moritz (born 1756), Johann Karl Furchtegott (born 1758), two daughters who both married (born between 1759 and 1766), August Wilhelm (born 1767), and Karl Wilhelm Friedrich (born 1772), the last two being the famous romanticists, survived him. Most of this information is to be found in the article on Johann Adolf in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, xxxi, 385 ff.

Some information is also necessary concerning the addressee, whom it is not difficult to identify with the help of the many hints given in our letter. She is Christiane Karoline Schlegel née Lucius, the "Babet," and "Demoiselle Lucius" of Gellert's letters. The

daughter of Karl Friedrich Lucius, "Kabinettsregistrator" in Dresden, she was born in that city on December 7, 1739. From 1760 until 1769, the year of Gellert's death, she corresponded zealously and elegantly with him. This correspondence was fully published by F. A. Ebert in 1823. On October 6, 1774, just three weeks before our letter was written, she married Pastor Gottlieb Schlegel in Burgwerben near Weissenfels. As Johann Adolf conjectures in our letter, his own and Gottlieb's grandfathers were brothers, so that he and Gottlieb were distantly related. Gottlieb died in 1813 in his eighty-second year, whereupon his wife returned to Dresden, where she died in 1833.<sup>1</sup>

The few other references of the letter which require elucidation will be taken up in footnotes. The text of the letter itself is as follows.

Wertheeste Cousine,

Erlauben Sie mir immer, daß ich Sie so nenne, gesetzt daß dieser Name auf die Art der Verwandtschaft, in welche ich mit Ihnen zu kommen die Ehre gehabt, nicht ganz passend seyn sollte. Ich mag ihn doch lieber hören, als die obersächsische Frau Muhme und die niedersächsische Frau Base—Warum es überhaupt ein Verwandtschaftsname seyn müssen?—Nein, das zu fragen, sind Sie zu gutig, und es ist, Ihrem Briefe nach, Ihnen gewiß nicht ganz gleichgültig, mit einem Manne, den Ihr seliger Freund bruderlich liebte,<sup>2</sup> in eine etwas nähere Verbindung gesetzt worden zu seyn. Ich aber habe über die neue Verwandtschaft eine viel zu große Freude, als daß ich nicht gleich Gebrauch davon machen sollte.—Doch wenn das wäre; woher denn die späte Antwort erst am 27 October auf einen Brief vom 12 September, und zwar auf einen Brief solchen<sup>3</sup> Inhalts? Wenn man sich ernstlich freut, pflegt man so saumselig nicht zu seyn—Alles, liebste Cousine, sehr wahr. Aber was kann ich dafür, daß ich diesen Brief erst am 15 October erhalten habe? In der That bin ich auf Herrn Reichen<sup>4</sup> über eine Zauderey, die ihm sonst nicht gewöhnlich ist, besonders dießmal sehr unwillig. Er hat mich eines doppelten Vergnügens beraubt; des Vergnügens, Ihnen und Ihrem Herrn Gemahle noch vor dem Antritte des neuen Standes meinen und meines ganzen Hauses herzlichen Antheil daran zu bezeugen, und das Vergnügen, an dem feyerlichen Tage Ihrer Verbindung in Gedanken

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. D. B., XIX, 352. For the year of her death cf. A. D. B., XXXI, 372. Cf. also Goedeke, *Grundriss*, v, 389

<sup>2</sup> Gellert is meant.

<sup>3</sup> The word "solchen" is underscored

<sup>4</sup> Philipp Erasmus Reich (1717-1787), a famous Leipzig book dealer, who was in close touch with almost every noted German author of his day. He was managing partner of the Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, which published works of Gellert, Goethe, Lavater, Wieland, and many others.

bey Ihnen gewesen zu seyn, und ihn hier mit meinen Freunden zu feyern. Da ich dessen entbehren müssen so will ich wenigstens eilen, daß ich nun nicht mich verspate, Sie an dem Orte Ihres neuen Aufenthalts zu bewillkommen. Ihre Ehe, liebste Madam Schlegeln (auch mit diesem Namen Sie nennen zu können, ist mir schmeichelhaft Wer hat so gar wenig Eigenliebe, so gar wenig Selbstheit, wenn ich dieß Wort wagen darf, daß er gegen den Namen, den er fuhret, ganz gleichgültig seyn sollte? Aber nun, da auch Sie ihn führen, klingt er mir doppelt angenehm) Ihre Ehe, liebste Madam Schlegeln müsse auf alle Weise gesegnet seyn, so glücklich, so reich an Freuden, als sichs erwarten läßt, wo Verstand und Herz, eine gründliche Denkungsart und eine fromme Zufriedenheit mit den Wegen der Vorsehung allen Begegnissen des Lebens eine weit reizendere Farbe geben Denn so angenehm es ist, stets heitre und frohliche Tage zu genießen; sie allein sind noch nicht genug. Unser eigentliches Glück muß uns doch Gemuthsruhe und gegenseitige Liebe geben; und beides wird Ihnen nicht fehlen können. Dafür burgen alle Blätter Ihres Briefwechsels mit dem seligen Gellert, und schon aus diesem wurde ich sicher wissen, daß Sie Ihr Herz an keinen andren, als einen würdigen Gemahl gegeben haben können, wenn ich auch nicht durch meinen rehburgischen Bruder so viel Gutes von ihm gehört hatte. Vermuthlich ist er ein Abkommling des sel. Inspektors Schlegel in Waldheim, und unsre Großväter werden Bruder seyn In derselben Gegend, wo der Ort Ihres neuen Aufenthalts sich befindet, bin ich nicht unbekannt. Auch das erweckt mir Vergnügen, und kömmt meiner Einbildungskraft zu Statte, daß ich mich leichter in Gedanken dahin versetzen kann. In Weißenfels selbst habe ich Anverwandte gehabt, und in meiner Jugend zweymal etliche Wochen vergnügt daselbst zugebracht. Ich habe auch anderthalb Jahre, die mir immer unvergeßlich bleiben werden, bey meinem Cramer zu Crollwitz, das unter die weißenfelsische Inspection gehört, alle Freuden der Freundschaft genossen, und ich und Cramer haben gleichfalls an Herrn Pastor Kuhn in Spergau,<sup>a</sup> das nach Merseburg zu liegt, einen sehr redlichen Freund gehabt. Auch Ihnen will ich in Ihrer Pflege einen freundschaftlichen Umgang herzlich wünschen, da die Freuden des Landlebens durch nichts so sehr, als durch eine zärtliche Ehe und einen freundschaftlichen Umgang verstärkt und gehoben werden können. Mir dunkt es, daß ich Burgwerben damals oft nennen gehört habe.

Ihre Briefe, theuerste Freundin, finden, wie ich mir versprochen habe, und habe versprechen müssen, allgemeinen Beyfall, und mein ältester Sohn<sup>c</sup> schreibt mir von Gottingen aus, daß er auch da nichts, als überall Ihr Lob hore.—Aber so haben Sie die Auswahl dabey nicht selbst getroffen, wie ich mir's aus Ihrem Briefe des vorigen Jahres vorgestellt? Zwar ich hätte mich huten sollen, dessen zu gedenken, da ich ihn zu beantworten unterlassen. Doch tragen in der That die gellertischen Scripturen, um welche Herr Reich so gewaltig trieb und mahnte, allein die Schuld daran, und ich

<sup>a</sup> Probably the father (or brother) of Karl Gottlob Kuhn (1754-1840), a noted physician, who also came from Spergau.

<sup>c</sup> Possibly Karl August Moritz (born 1756) is meant

hoffe deswegen von Ihnen um so viel leichter Verzeihung, da diese Unhöflichkeit nicht aus meiner Nachlässigkeit, der ich am ersten selbst das Urtheil sprechen wurde, sondern bloß aus dem Eifer hergeruhret, dem Geschaffte, das mir unser seliger gemeinschaftlicher Freund auferleget, nach allen meinen Kräften Genüge zu thun. Seit ich indessen die Papiere mit meinen Anmerkungen in der letzten Fastenzeit an Herrn Mag. Heyern<sup>7</sup> abgeliefert, habe ich von allem nichts weiter gehört, als bis nun die Sammlung im Drucke erschienen ist. Meine darüber geschriebnen Papiere sind an mich unterwegs. Ihre Briefe werden nun auch wohl wieder in Ihren Händen seyn. Und wie sollte ich noch weiter auf ein eignes und alsbaldiges Verbrennen der gellertischen Briefe dringen, da Sie in der Nothwendigkeit, wegen der Zukunft Vorsicht dabey zu gebrauchen, mit mir so einstimmig denken, und die Maaßregeln, die Sie treffen wollen, eben so sicher sind, als mein Vorschlag, der, wie ich selbst wohl erkannte, als ich ihn that, für das Andenken, oder vielmehr für die Schatzung unsers sel. Gellerts gegen alles, was mit der Zeit seinem Ruhme nachtheilig werden konnte, ein Opfer forderte, das Ihrem freundschaftlichen Herzen zu viel kosten wurde?

Empfehlen Sie mich der Freundschaft Ihres Herrn Gemahls, und fahren auch Sie fort, mich derselben zu würdigen. Eben darum bitten auch meine Frau, meine Sohne, meine Töchter, die sichs beide sehr angelegen seyn lassen, Ihnen nachzueifern. Vorzuglich hat die älteste, wie das natürlich ist, da sie einige Jahre voraus hat, und in ihrem sechzehnten Jahre steht, voritzu keinen angelegentlichern Wunsch, als wie sie die Kunst, schöne Briefe zu schreiben, Ihnen mit der Zeit ablernen möge, und beiden kann ich das Zeugniß geben, daß Ihre Briefe fleißig in ihren Händen sind, und von Ihnen mit eben so viel Vergnügen, als Eifer, studiert werden. Leben Sie wohl, theuerste Freundin, mit Ihrem Schlegel, allerzeit so wohl, als es Ihnen beiden von Herzen wünscht

Ihr

ergebenster Vetter und Diener,

Johann Adolf Schlegel

Hannover

den 27 October

1774.

Und obschon Herr Reich Ihren Brief so lange liegen lassen, muß ich die Bestellung des meinigen ihm wieder auftragen, weil ich nicht gewiß bin, ob ich in Absicht auf den Ort die Adresse recht machen möchte.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL

*University of Cincinnati*

---

<sup>7</sup> Gottlieb Leberecht Heyer had also collaborated with Schlegel in publishing Gellert's *Moralische Vorlesungen*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1770. The present reference is to their publication of Gellert's letters, undertaken at Gellert's request, as our letter tells us; the letters appeared separately in three volumes (Leipzig, 1774), and in the same year and place also as volumes 8-10 of Gellert's *Sämmtliche Schriften*.



A NIETZSCHE EPISODE IN THOMAS MANN'S  
'DOKTOR FAUSTUS'

Thomas Mann, who is well versed in Friedrich Nietzsche's life and writings, has drawn on the latter's experiences for an incident of considerable importance in his novel *Doktor Faustus, Das Leben des deutschen Tonsetzers Adrian Leverkühn, erzählt von einem Freunde*.<sup>1</sup>

The incident, as narrated at some length by Mann, may be summed up as follows: On his arrival in Leipzig Adrian Leverkühn, a young student, engages a man to show him the important sights of the city. When he is finally asked to take Adrian to a good inn for a meal, the waggish guide, having received his pay, conducts the unsuspecting lad to a brothel where he is confronted by unaccustomed sights. Adrian conceals his emotions, steps to an open piano, strikes two or three chords while standing, and escapes into the street after he has been gently and fleetingly caressed by a little brunette.

There need be no doubt as to Mann's source for this rather striking episode, since he has indicated it himself in an article entitled "Nietzsches Philosophie im Lichte unserer Erfahrung." Here Mann refers to a statement by Nietzsche's friend and follow-student Paul Deussen who later became a distinguished Sanskrit scholar. Nietzsche's story, as narrated by him to Deussen, is retold as follows by Mann:

Der junge Mann [Nietzsche] hatte allein einen Ausflug nach Köln gemacht und dort einen Dienstmann engagiert, damit er ihm die Sehenswürdigkeiten der Stadt zeige. Das geht den ganzen Nachmittag, und schließlich, gegen Abend, fordert Nietzsche seinen Führer auf, ihm ein empfehlenswertes Restaurant zu zeigen. Der Kerl aber . . . führt ihn in ein Freudenhaus. Der Jüngling, rein wie ein Mädchen, ganz Geist, ganz Gelehrsamkeit, ganz fromme Scheu, sieht sich, so sagt er, plötzlich umgeben von einem halben Dutzend Erscheinungen in Flitter und Gaze, die ihn erwartungsvoll ansehen. Zwischen ihnen hindurch geht der junge Musiker, Philolog und Schopenhauer-Verehrer instinktiv auf ein Klavier zu, das er im Hintergrunde des teuflischen Salons gewahrt, und worin er (das sind seine Worte) "das einzige seelenhafte Wesen in der Gesellschaft" erblickt, und schlägt einige

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Mann, *Doktor Faustus*, Stockholm, Bermann-Fischer, 1947, pp. 220 f.

Akkorde an    Das lost seinen Bann, seine Erstarrung, und er gewinnt das Freie, er vermag zu fliehen.<sup>2</sup>

Here Mann has faithfully reproduced the outward facts as told by Deussen and chronicled by the Nietzsche biographer Helmut Walther Brann.<sup>3</sup> This episode, however, is not merely an unusual anecdote, for it assumes tragic importance in the life of Adrian Leverkühn and in Nietzsche's life as viewed by Mann. Of Nietzsche, Mann says:

Ein Jahr also, nachdem er aus jenem Kölner Hause geflohen, kehrt er, ohne diabolische Fuhung diesmal, an einen solchen Ort zurück und zieht sich—einige sagen absichtlich, als Selbstbestrafung—zu, was sein Leben zerrütten, aber auch ungeheuer steigern—ja, wovon auch teils glückliche, teils fatale Reizwirkungen auf eine ganze Epoche ausgehen sollen.<sup>4</sup>

How does Adrian Leverkühn's subsequent experience compare with this one of Nietzsche? When after a search Adrian finally finds the brunette whom he calls Esmeralda, the brunette who had gently embraced him, she warns him of her diseased body, for she had but recently been discharged from a hospital. Here, just as Mann purports to be the case with Nietzsche, there is a fixation which lures the young man back and induces infection and ruin. Mann writes of Adrian's impulsions to return to the girl:

Und, gutiger Himmel, war es nicht Liebe auch, oder was war es, welche Vergessenheit, welcher Wille zum gottversuchenden Wagnis, welcher Trieb, die Strafe in die Sünde einzubeziehen, endlich, welches tief geheimste Verlangen nach dämonischer Empfängnis, nach einer tödlich entfesselnden chymischen Veränderung seiner Natur wirkte dahin, daß der Gewarnte die Warnung verschmähte und auf dem Besitz dieses Fleisches bestand?<sup>5</sup>

According to Mann, both Adrian Leverkühn and Nietzsche, the victims of a similar experience, become luetically infected and end in insanity.

Mann writes that Nietzsche was not altogether aware of the impression which his first visit to the brothel had made on him:

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Mann, "Nietzsches Philosophie im Lichte unserer Erfahrung," *Die Neue Rundschau*, Achtes Heft, Herbst 1947, pp. 362 f.

<sup>3</sup> Helmut W. Brann, *Nietzsche und die Frauen*, Leipzig, Meiner, 1931, p. 16.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 363.

<sup>5</sup> *Doktor Faustus*, p. 239.

Es war aber nicht mehr und nicht weniger, als was die Psychologen ein "Trauma" nennen, eine Erschütterung, deren wachsende, die Phantasie nie wieder loslassende Nachwirkung von der Empfanglichkeit des Heiligen für die Sünde zeugt.<sup>6</sup>

He then cites a poem from *Zarathustra*, written twenty years later, whose eroticism reflects the impact of this episode. Here Mann seems to have drawn on the following passage from Brann who refers to the same personages in *Zarathustra* with an explanation much like that given by Mann:

Die *Antipathie*, die der junge Nietzsche so offensichtlich den kölnischen Venusdienerinnen entgegenbrachte, *wandelte sich* allmählich infolge des Ausbleibens jeder ernst zu nehmenden geschlechtlichen Befriedigungsmöglichkeit *in eine Art angstlicher Sympathie* um, bis diese Bordellmädchen schließlich zu dem verführerischen Bilde der prachtvollen Wustendamen, der Dudus und Suleikas Modell stehen mußten. . . .<sup>7</sup>

Mann's reference to the element of "Selbstbestrafung" in Adrian Leverkühn's and Nietzsche's return to the brothel is paralleled by Brann's statement:

*Außerdem aber scheint Nietzsche . . . die Infektion—aus inneren Subgrund—bewußt herbeigeführt zu haben.* Eine solche Haltung ließe sich ohne weiteres aus seiner besonderen Seelenlage erklären; es entsprache seinem geistigen Stolz, auf diese Weise für das Vergehen gegen seine eigene ethische Höhe Selbstjustiz geübt zu haben.<sup>8</sup>

It is significant for both Adrian Leverkühn and Nietzsche that their long malady caused excruciating suffering and periods of depression but that it also seemed to stimulate unusual mental and creative processes. Both were revolutionary in their ideas which found expression respectively in music and in philosophy.

A few external parallels might be added. Both men studied at the University of Leipzig, both lived lonely lives; neither one of them married. Neither gained wide recognition at a time when such recognition might have served as a heightened stimulus to achievement. Nietzsche and Adrian Leverkühn both died on the same day of the month, August 25, at the age of fifty-five, after each had been demented for about a decade. Both were cared for by their mothers after insanity had set in.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 362.

<sup>7</sup> Brann, *op. cit.*, p. 139.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 208.

It should not be overlooked that with artistic imagination Mann, the novelist, developed the episode which was but briefly narrated by Deussen, and whose significance in the life of Nietzsche was carefully examined by Brann. Brann's conclusions, with which Mann is in general accord, seem to have been amplified by the latter in the character of Adrian Leverkühn in *Doktor Faustus*.

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL

Wesleyan University

---

### THE SUFFOCATION OF THE MOTHER

When Lear leaves the house of Goneril, thinking to find refuge with Regan, he arrives at Gloucester's castle on the way. There he finds Regan and her husband, who have determinedly left home to avoid providing for him, and who have put his messenger in the stocks. Lear then cries out against his physical symptoms, which have been brought on by his emotional state:

O, how this mother swells up toward my heart!  
Hysterica passio, down, thou climbing sorrow,  
Thy element's below.<sup>1</sup>

Editors usually comment little more on this passage than to say that *the mother* is a disease which is associated with a feeling of strangulation. Since Elizabethan physicians considered that there was no malady of the female system to be compared to this, "either for varietie, or for strangenesse of accidents,"<sup>2</sup> it may be interesting to examine the nature and causes of this ailment.

<sup>1</sup> II. iv. 56-58. "Mother," obviously, is another name for the womb, matrix, or uterus.

<sup>2</sup> Edward Jorden, *A briefe discourse of a disease called the suffocation of the mother. Written vppon occasion which hath beene of late taken thereby, to suspect possession of an euil spirit, or some such like supernaturall power. Wherin is declared that dyuers strange actions and passions of the body of man, which in the common opinion, are imputed to the Diuell, haue their true naturall causes, and do accompanie this disease*, London, 1603, fol. 1v. This work was dedicated to the president and fellows of the College of Physicians, the dedication being dated March 2, 1602, and signed by Jorden as a colleague. In the year 1665, there were 28,709 deaths in London, exclusive of those which were due to the plague. Of these, 2,036 were the result of "Convulsion and Mother"; see A. Wolf, *A History of*

Besides the English name of *the mother*, or *the suffocation of the mother*, the disease goes under several other names: *Passio Hysterica*, *Suffocatio*, *Præfocatio*, *Strangulatus uteri*, *Caducus matricis*, etc. The malady is not called "suffocation" because of the strangulation of the womb, but because the most common symptom is that of choking.<sup>3</sup> The explanation given by Dr. John Sadler, of Norwich, is that the uterus is retracted

towards the Diaphragme and stomacke, which presseth and crusheth up the same, that the instrumentall cause of respiration the midriffe is suffocatèd, which consenting with the braine causeth the Animall facultie the efficient cause of respiration also to be intercepted, whereby the body being refrigerated, and the actions depraved, she falls to the ground, as one being dead.<sup>4</sup>

Dr. Edward Jorden, a fellow of the College of Physicians, calls this "the rising of the Mother," and states that the condition may be labeled *morbus in situ*, since the compression of the diaphragm results in difficult breathing.<sup>5</sup> A fit of this nature may last for two or three days, and thus it is that there were laws enacted to prevent the burial of any woman subject to this disease until she had been dead for three days.<sup>6</sup> Also, there may be some difficulty in diagnosis, because the disease sometimes resembles apoplexy and sometimes epilepsy. It differs from apoplexy, however, in that there is no shrieking or loss of feeling, and from epilepsy in that there is no foaming at the mouth, and the "eyes are not wrested."<sup>7</sup>

Besides these symptoms of choking and a violent convulsion or paroxysm, many other manifestations are often noted. Sometimes the patient will make strange animal sounds in the throat:

Croaking of Frogges, hissing of Snakes, crowing of Cockes, barking of Dogges, garring of Crowes.<sup>8</sup>

At other times the patient will have laughing, singing, or weeping spells, often accompanied by hiccoughs. Jorden continues that

*Science, Technology, and Philosophy in the 16th & 17th Centuries*, London, 1935, pp. 589-591.

<sup>3</sup> Jorden, *op. cit.*, fol. 5. See John Sadler, *The Sick Womans private Looking-glasse*, London, 1636, p. 61.

<sup>4</sup> Sadler, *ibid.*, pp. 61-62.

<sup>5</sup> Jorden, *op. cit.*, fol. 7<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 10; Sadler, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

<sup>7</sup> Sadler, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

<sup>8</sup> Jorden, *op. cit.*, fol. 2.

these manifestations are frequently so terrifying that some physicians, even,

are oftentimes deceyued, imagining such manifolde straunge accidents . . . to proceed from some metaphysicall power, when in deed . . . they are meerely natural<sup>9</sup>

Jorden is most explicit in this matter, since the title of his work states that the book was written particularly to counteract a tendency to blame the disease upon possession by an evil spirit. This latter conception, indeed, is maintained in the *Declaration*, where Harsnet gives an account of a man who believed himself to have had this disease from the devil.<sup>10</sup>

Palpitation of the heart "or Arteries" is another symptom of the suffocation of the mother:

It is chiefly to bee perceyued where the Arteries are great & neare the skin as vnder the left ribbes towards the backe, and in the necke: as you may obserue in Maides that haue the greene sicknesse, by the shaking and quuering of their ruffes, if they sit close to their neckes where sometimes through the dilatation of the Arterie there ariseth a tumour as bigge as ones fist.<sup>11</sup>

In fact, there is no symptom of any disease connected with the principal functions of the body, "either animall, vitall, or naturall," which may not be observed in this malady, because

of the communitie and consent which this part hath with the braine, heart, and luer, the principall seates of these three functions; and the easie passage which it hath vnto them by the Vaines, Arteries, and Nerues.<sup>12</sup>

A modern physician would recognize these remarks to apply to what is now simply called hysteria, especially the fact that the disease may have a variety of manifestations. Until late in the nineteenth century, it was thought that hysteria was confined to females, and was caused by the uterus moving to various sections of the body.

There is not much agreement among the physicians as to the

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> Harsnet, *Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures*, 1603, p. 263; noted in Kittredge, *Sixteen Plays of Shakespeare*, 1946, note to II. iv. 56-58.

<sup>11</sup> Jorden, *op. cit.*, fol. 9v.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 1v.

causes of the suffocation of the mother. Dr. Jorden writes that there may be internal causes, such as unhealthy conditions in the spirit, the blood, the humors, the excrement, etc.; or there may be external causes, such as improper meat and drink, lack of sleep, annoying smells and noises, too much riding or swimming, the bites of venomous beasts, or perturbations of the mind.<sup>13</sup> Jorden's references to laughing and weeping spells as symptoms and to perturbations of the mind as causes, would lead us to believe that he may have recognized many of the manifestations of the disease to be psychosomatic in origin. Dr. Sadler, on the other hand, lists five possible causes of the suffocation of the mother, as follows: corruption and retention of the ova, dryness of the uterus, suppression of the menstrual flow, abortion, or difficult child-birth.<sup>14</sup>

It may be wondered what all of this has to do with Lear, since his anatomy is obviously deficient for such a disease. Apparently a male who presented choking as a nervous symptom was, by analogy, said to be suffering from the same disease. We have already noted the case of the man with demoniac possession who stated that he had had an attack of the suffocation of the mother while he was in France. At that time a Scottish physician, then resident in Paris, explained this man's ailment as being due to

a wind in the bottome of the belly, and proceeding with a great swelling, causeth a very painfull collicke in the stomach, and an extraordinary giddines in the head.<sup>15</sup>

The Scottish doctor named the symptom *Vertiginem capitis*, or fainting. He seems to have been an ancestor of the modern physician who gives the Latin equivalent of a symptom and feels that he has made a proper diagnosis.

CARROLL CAMDEN

*The Rice Institute*

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, fols. 18v-23.

<sup>14</sup> Sadler, *op. cit.*, pp 66-67.

<sup>15</sup> Harsnet, *loc cit* Lear may well have a recurrence of his symptoms just before he dies, when he says, "Pray you, undo this button." (v. iii. 309.)

## HENRY VAUGHAN'S CONVERSION: A RECENT VIEW

The most recent view of Henry Vaughan's religious conversion demonstrates that "The Authors Preface" (1654) to the re-issue of *Silex Scintillans* (1655) deserves more careful attention than it has yet received. In his *Henry Vaughan A Life and Interpretation* Dr. F. E. Hutchinson argues that the poet's conversion was complete by 1650. Dr. Hutchinson's argument overlooks the significance of the preface of 1654, and this oversight leads him to lodge, unintentionally, an indictment on the poet that is as severe as it is unjust.

His chapter on the conversion opens with a quotation from "The World," and his comments on this and four other poems "in the first issue of *Silex Scintillans*" (1650) introduce this assertion:

The author of *Silex Scintillans* was a changed man, and this change is of the highest importance in the consideration of him as poet. Unlike the miscellaneous collections of *Poems* and *Olor Iscanus*, *Silex Scintillans*, from the first poem 'Regeneration' to the last, is profoundly religious and mystical, not only in phrase but in temper; it is as purely religious as *The Temple*. We need to ask what has given this new direction to his thoughts and caused him to produce poems so immediately different, in tone and subject and achievement, from anything he had written before.<sup>1</sup>

This is a clear statement that Vaughan's spiritual development was complete in 1650 and that his attitude then was entirely different from that which had produced *Poems* and *Olor Iscanus*. But it is impossible to reconcile this opinion with the fact that the secular poem "To Sir William D'avenant, upon his *Gondibert*"<sup>2</sup> (in *Olor Iscanus*) cannot have been written earlier than 1650. It seems necessary therefore merely to mention that Dr. Hutchinson's examination, throughout the remainder of the chapter, of the causes of the "new direction" does much more to disprove than to establish his view.

Since the author himself is convinced that Vaughan's conversion had reached fulfillment by 1650, he falls quite naturally into an old error of supposing that it was the poet's new religious principles that delayed publication of *Olor Iscanus*:

<sup>1</sup> Page 99.

<sup>2</sup> *Works of Henry Vaughan*, ed. L. C. Martin (Oxford, 1914), i, 64-65.



The postponement of the publication of *Olor Iscanus* for about three years and a half after the dedication was written [on "17 of Decemb. 1647"] is almost certainly to be explained by the change of mind with which Vaughan had come to view his secular verse after he had turned his attention to writing almost [*sic*] exclusively sacred verse.<sup>3</sup>

Lately printed evidence on this problem then forces Dr. Hutchinson into a rather painful explanation of the editorial procedure in the publishing of this work in 1651:

It would appear probable that Powell overcame Vaughan's reluctance so far as to allow him to make a selection from his work in verse and prose and be responsible for the publication. No one but Vaughan can have given him access to his manuscripts, and probably there was some discussion between Vaughan and his editor as to what should be included in the volume of 1651. As a proof of his new-found religious ardour, Vaughan must seek to reduce any sense of inconsistency between the tone of *Olor Iscanus* and that of *Silex Scintillans* already published in the previous year. This might be best effected by describing the poems on the title-page as 'Formerly written' and 'Published by a Friend,' which, together with the preface, would reduce the author's responsibility for publishing his secular verse.<sup>4</sup>

If on the face of it this looks only a little like compromising the poet's character, we miss the full implication of the author's argument. Here we must consider in some detail "The Authors Preface" of 1654, from which Dr. Hutchinson quotes in his discussion of the conversion.

Early in that preface Vaughan vehemently denounces the "*idle books*" and "*vitious verse*" of his time and declares that

To continue (after years of discretion) in this *vanity*, is an inexcusable desertion of *pious sobriety*; and to persist so to the end, is a wilful despising of Gods *sacred exhortations*, by a constant, sensual volutation or wallowing in *impure thoughts* and *scurrilous conceits*, which both defile their Authors, and as many more, as they are communicated to.<sup>5</sup>

Later comes this:

And here, because I would prevent a just *censure* by my free *confession*, I must remember, that I my self have for many years together, languished of this very *sickness*; and it is no long time since I have recovered. But (blessed be God for it!) I have by his saving assistance supprest my

<sup>3</sup> Page 73.

<sup>4</sup> Page 77.

<sup>5</sup> *Works*, ed. Martin, ii, 389.

*greatest follies*, and those which escaped from me, are (I think) as innoxious, as most of that *vain* use to be, besides, they are interlined with many virtuous, and some pious mixtures. What I speak of them, is truth, but let no man mistake it for an *extenuation* of faults, as if I intended an *Apology* for them, or my *self*, who am conscious of so much *guilt* in both, as can never be expiated without *special sorrows*, and that cleansing and pretious *effusion* of my Almighty Redeemer: and if the world will be so charitable, as to grant my request, I do here most humbly and earnestly beg that none would read them.<sup>6</sup>

The first two statements in this paragraph have already received due attention, but the rest of it has not. Taken as a whole, the paragraph is unmistakably an outright renunciation of his secular verse then published, and avowedly in spite of the fact that it contained nothing reprehensible by conventional standards and even had much that was edifying. And in this same document Vaughan clearly explains his attitude. Further on, he states his conviction that the "evil disease" of profane and lewd writing requires an antidote which able writers can provide by concerning themselves exclusively with sacred subjects:

The suppression of this pleasing and prevailing *evil*, lies not altogether in the power of the *Magistrate*, for it will flie abroad in *Manuscripts*, when it fails of entertainment at the *press*. The true remedy lies wholly in their bosoms, who are the gifted persons, by a wise exchange of *vain* and *vitious subjects*, for *divine Themes* and *Celestial praise*. The *performance* is easie, and were it the most difficult in the world, the *reward* is so glorious, that it infinitely transcends it, for *they that turn many to righteousness, shall shine like the stars for ever and ever: . . .*<sup>7</sup>

This, I submit, is a clear statement that the true function of writers is evangelical and that it is their moral responsibility to consider secular writing as inimical to Christianity.

Vaughan then points to "Mr. *George Herbert*, whose holy *life* and *verse* gained many pious *Converts*," but, says Vaughan, "After him followed diverse,—*Sed non passibus æquis*: they had more of *fashion*, then *force*." He turns thus upon these writers whose offense consisted, not in a choice of "vitious" subjects, but in their failure to approximate Herbert's true piety:

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 390.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 391.

Hence sprang those wide, those weak, and lean *conceptions*, which in the most inclinable *Reader* will scarce give any nourishment or help to *devotion*; for not flowing from a true, practick piety, it was impossible they should effect those things abroad, which they never had acquaintance with at home, being only the productions of a common spirit, and the obvious ebullitions of that light humor, which takes the pen in hand, out of no other consideration, than to be seen in print.<sup>8</sup>

He insists that

It is true indeed, that to give up our thoughts to pious *Themes* and *Contemplations* (if it be done for pieties sake) is a great *step* towards *perfection*; because it will *refine*, and *dispose* to devotion and sanctity.<sup>9</sup>

And then comes this commitment:

To effect this in some measure, I have begged leave to communicate this my poor *Talent* to the *Church*, under the *protection* and *conduct* of her *glorious Head* who (if he will vouchsafe to *own* it, and *go along* with it) can make it as useful now in the *publick*, as it hath been to me in *private*.<sup>10</sup>

Under careful examination, then, "The Authors Preface" of 1654 turns out to be not only an emphatic denunciation of the "*idle books*" and "*vitious verse*" of the time, but also (1) a fervent plea that all responsible writers combat this evil by devoting their talents exclusively to pious subjects, (2) a plain commitment that the author is making himself a suitable example, and (3) a solemn condemnation of *all* his secular verse as expressions of his previous unregeneracy. Dr. Hutchinson's view does not allow this preface to signify any important development in Vaughan's religious feeling after 1650. Hence, in his description of the editorial arrangement for the publication of *Olor Iscanus* in 1651 he unwittingly places Vaughan in the role of a thoroughgoing hypocrite conniving in a scheme to promote the benefits of his duplicity.

E. L. MARILLA

Louisiana State University

---

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 391.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 392.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 391-392.

COWLEY AND EVEYLN'S *KALENDARIVM HORTENSE*

Such well known Cowley scholars as Gough, Loiseau, Tilley and Nethercot<sup>1</sup> have long since set down the facts of the friendship shared by the diarist John Evelyn and the poet Abraham Cowley. The two men were, in their outlooks on life, admirably suited to be close companions, and by their mutual interest in gardening were drawn into a special intimacy, particularly during the years just after the Restoration when Cowley, who had retired to Barn Elms, plied his horticulturist friend with questions on gardening, planted seeds Evelyn had given him, and even transcribed for his own guidance the whole of the uncorrected manuscript of Evelyn's *Kalendarium Hortense: or, The Gardener's Almanac* sometime before the author had prepared it for the press.

So pleased was Evelyn at the interest his friend had manifested in the garden book that he decided to dedicate the *Kalendar* to Cowley and prior to publication addressed the dedication to Cowley in the form of a letter. The retired poet, flattered by the compliment, replied by addressing 'To J. Evelyn, Esq.' in a letter dated August 16, 1666, the now famous essay 'The Garden.' Evelyn published the dedication and the reply together in the 1666 edition of the *Kalendar*.

The one peculiar aspect of this exchange of courtesies is that, although the friendship of the two men antedates by years the publication of the 1664 first edition of the *Kalendar*, Evelyn did not address a dedication to Cowley until the 1666 second edition wherein he begins his dedicatory epistle with words revealing clearly the deliberateness of his act: 'Sir, This *Second Edition* of my *Hortulan Kalendar* is due to you. . . .'

Scholars have been silent on the point and may perhaps never work out a complete explanation for Evelyn's action, yet certain plausible conjectures warrant examination, and some new light is shed on the problem by the third of 'Three Unpublished Letters

<sup>1</sup> See A. B. Gough, *Abraham Cowley. The Essays and Other Prose Writings* (Oxford, 1915), pp. 340-41; Jean Loiseau, *Abraham Cowley sa vie, son œuvre* (Paris, 1931), pp. 164, 658; A. Tilley, rev. ed. *Cowley's Essays* (Cambridge, 1923), p. 126; A. H. Nethercot, *Abraham Cowley: The Muse's Hannibal* (London, 1931), pp. 237-39, 261.

of Abraham Cowley' printed in *Modern Language Notes* in 1939.<sup>2</sup> Professor Howard Vincent, the editor of the letters, describes the third one as embodying 'a most graceful and friendly acknowledgment of the dedication to him [Cowley] of Evelyn's second edition of *Kalendarium Hortense*.'<sup>3</sup> Actually, however, the date of the letter (March 7, 1663/4), its contents, and Evelyn's superscription on the verso all point to the fact that Cowley is here thanking Evelyn for his dedication of the first edition and that hence Evelyn must have dedicated to Cowley both the first and second editions of his *Kalendar*.

The first edition of the *Kalendar* does not exist in a separate volume as the second and some of the later editions do. It was printed with *Pomona* as appendices to Evelyn's much longer work, *Sylva*, commissioned by the Royal Society. In the entry to his diary dated February 16, 1663/4, Evelyn states: 'I presented my 'Sylva' to the Society.' On March 2, 1663/4, he notes: 'Went to London to distribute some of my books among friends.' Five days later, on March 7, 1663/4, Cowley, writing from 'London,' pens his letter of thanks to Evelyn. On the verso of the Cowley letter Evelyn wrote, before carefully numbering it and filing it away: 'From Mr: Cowley 7<sup>th</sup> March 1663/4 upon my Dedication of my Calendaria 55.' In the body of the letter itself Cowley alludes to the fact that the *Kalendar* is only one part of the complete volume:

Sr,

As I have long had many obligations to you for very great civilities, soe I find them now increased beyond the reach of my thanks by the present you have bin pleased to make mee of y<sup>r</sup> most excellent and usefull Book, and more especially for the extraordinary honour you have done mee in adorning my Name w<sup>th</sup> the addresse of one part of it, and w<sup>th</sup> illustrious testimonies of y<sup>r</sup> affection and esteem<sup>4</sup>

Thus two years before Evelyn had addressed to Cowley the dedicatory epistle of his second edition of the *Kalendar* and Cowley had replied with his epistolary essay 'The Garden,' the two men had exchanged courteous acknowledgments of their mutual esteem on the event of the dedication of the first edition of the same book.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. Lrv, No 6 (June, 1939), pp. 454-58.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 457.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 457-58.

Helpful as Professor Vincent's third Cowley letter is in clearing up one aspect of the Evelyn-Cowley relationship, it poses at the same time the perplexing questions of what form Evelyn's original dedication took and what has happened to it, since the first edition of the *Kalendar* bears no dedication addressed to Cowley.

It is possible that Evelyn sent the dedication in the form of a letter accompanying the volume, wherein he explained to Cowley that since the *Sylva*, the major work of the volume, was dedicated to King Charles II, and since the *Kalendar* would probably be reprinted in a few years as a separate volume, he preferred waiting until that more fitting time to address his dedication publicly to his friend.

A second explanation is that Evelyn simply penned on the 1664 title-page of his no longer extant gift copy of the *Kalendar* a dedication to Cowley, and then just before the publication of the second edition took the opportunity to send the poet a formal dedicatory epistle which in turn moved Cowley to write 'The Garden.'

The third, and most plausible explanation, in light of the meager evidence, is that Cowley's copy of the *Sylva-Kalendar* volume did contain a printed dedication addressed to Cowley, which for some reason, unknown to us but sufficient for Evelyn and later explainable to Cowley, had been cut out of all other copies of the first edition.

The phrasing of Cowley's letter seems to indicate (1) that his gift copy did contain some kind of a dedication in which Evelyn made 'the addresse of one part of it' to Cowley 'w<sup>th</sup> illustrious testimonies of . . . affection and esteem' and (2) that that dedication was in some form in which Cowley thought it could be read in other copies, i. e., in print; otherwise Cowley would hardly have written later in the letter, 'I designed noe other advantages of my Country Retreat but y<sup>t</sup> of Quiet and little imagined the gaining of Fame too in the obscurity of it.'<sup>5</sup>

The third bit of evidence is contained in a letter which Evelyn wrote to Lady Sunderland on August 4, 1690, thirty-six years after the appearance of the first edition of the *Kalendar*. In discussing the *Kalendar*, Evelyn alludes to the acceptance the work found with his 'deare' and 'worthy friend Mr. Cowley, upon whose reputation only it has survived seaven impressions, & is now

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 458.

entering on the eighth. . . .'<sup>6</sup> Granted that Evelyn has forgot about the exact state of the first edition during the long interval and that his statement constitutes an almost absurd exaggeration of Cowley's influence in keeping the *Kalendar* in print, the fact remains that Evelyn has associated Cowley's name with the work from the first.

The final piece of evidence rests with the physical state of the first edition of the *Kalendar* itself which lacks leaf H1, the leaf immediately following the *Kalendar* title-page, G4, and preceding the 'Introduction to the *Kalendar*,' H2. In other words the leaf missing is that which would customarily bear the dedication, provided one had existed. Keynes notes the absence of the leaf in his bibliographical study of Evelyn's writings but can only observe that 'there is no indication of what were the contents of the cancelled leaf H1.'<sup>7</sup>

My search for a copy of the first edition of the *Sylva-Kalendar* containing the missing leaf among all twenty-two recorded copies<sup>8</sup> of the volume has proved unfruitful, but it appears likely that at least one copy bearing Evelyn's original dedication to Cowley did exist or may still exist in an unrecorded location.

C. WILLIAM MILLER

Temple University

---

#### A NEW AMERICAN SHAKESPEARE ALLUSION

The recent discovery in the private library of an English family of some hitherto missing numbers of the *New-York Gazette*,<sup>1</sup> the first newspaper published in New York, not only gives the

<sup>6</sup> Quoted by Geoffrey Keynes, *John Evelyn: A Study in Bibliophily and A Bibliography of his Writings*. (New York: Grolier Club, 1937), p. 150.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 152.

<sup>8</sup> Keynes, *ibid.*, p. 298 lists ten copies with locations; the other twelve copies are located in the libraries of Edinburgh University, Glasgow University, Balliol and Magdalen Colleges, Oxford; Harvard University, University of Illinois, Massachusetts Agricultural Society, Missouri Botanical Garden, University of Pennsylvania, United States Department of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin, and Williams College (Chapin).

<sup>1</sup> Gerald D. McDonald, "A Gift of the New-York Gazette," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, vol. 40, June, 1936, pp. 487-93.

announcement of a projected performance of a Shakespearean play in America twenty years earlier than any previously recorded,<sup>2</sup> but also supplies a new Shakespeare allusion coming, through Dryden, from the Restoration actor Charles Hart, the Grandson of Shakespeare's sister. This carries it back near enough to Shakespeare, in both time and source, to give it credence.

In number 229 of the *New-York Gazette*, dated "from March 16, to Monday March 23, 1729 [1730]," appeared a very curious page signed by "Joachimus Bertrand," who stated that he was a physician. Although it purports to be the announcement of a performance of *Romeo and Juliet* scheduled for a week later, it contains much else. It quotes fifty-one lines from the play, most of those which have anything to do with medicine or the apothecary, offers some critical comment on a few of them; gives a résumé of the plot; invites "the Ladies to be present the first night" when the writer will play the part of the Apothecary in the performance at the Revenge Meeting-House; and ends with the following paragraph:

I shall conclude this Paper with an Observation of *Mr Dryden's*, which (he us'd to say) he had by Tradition from a co-temporary of *Shakespears*, as low as *Hart* the great Player, 'Satyr was not Shakespears genius, but the good natur'd Man had been ill treated when very young, by the *Curate & Apothecary* of the Parish, the latter had given him a *Clyster*, which was not carried off but with danger of his Life, and the other regularly prescrib'd him an *Opiate* every Sunday, for the effects of which he was as regularly whipt every Monday following, and could never afterwards (notwithstanding this Discipline) be broke of sleeping in Sermon time.

Dr. Joachimus Bertrand, the New York physician of 1730, could very well have heard Dryden repeat this story. The genealogical records so far have not disclosed who Joachimus Bertrand was, nor when nor from where he came to New York, but, since Dryden died in 1700, it was not impossible for the two to have known each other in London.

The contact between Dryden and Hart is well established. Hart not only played such Shakespearean roles as *Othello*, *Brutus*, and *Hotspur*, but he also played leading parts in a number of Dryden's plays. Dryden was one of the first critics to acknowledge Shake-

<sup>2</sup> George Freedley, "An Early Performance of 'Romeo and Juliet' in New York," *ibid.*, pp. 494-5.



speare's genius. It is not unlikely that he picked up stories about the poet from this grandson of Shakespeare's sister.

How far may Dr. Bertrand's statements be relied upon? While he is cleverly advertising himself—he asks that his appearance as the Apothecary “will be kindly taken and look'd upon as a great condescension in a *Physician*”—he is also discussing the coming performance of *Romeo and Juliet* in the way any enthusiastic amateur might announce a home production.<sup>3</sup> If he had known that Hart was Shakespeare's grand-nephew, he would probably have mentioned it to give authority to his story. The fact that he apparently does not know how close the source of the story is to Shakespeare himself lends support to his statement that he had it from Dryden.

It is only a light story, probably nothing more than a joke to begin with. The relation between any lack of native genius in “Satyr” on Shakespeare's part and his ill treatment at the hands of the “*Curate & Apothecary*” is not immediately apparent. Perhaps it is intended to explain why “the good natur'd Man” had ultimately resorted to the use of satire. It is the type of jest which might live around the play house. It would have a special interest to Dr. Bertrand since it concerned his own profession.

ALFRED WESTFALL

Colorado A & M College

CAESAR'S SWORD (*FAERIE QUEENE* II. x. 49; *LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST* v. ii. 615)

In the second book of the *Faerie Queene* Prince Arthur finds in the library of the Castle of Alma “An auncient booke, hight *Briton monuments*,” in which, among other stories, he reads how Julius Caesar, invading England,

was charged heuilly  
Of hardy *Nennius*, whom he yet did slay  
But lost his sword, yet to be seene this day.

In Geoffrey of Monmouth (iv. iii) after this Nennius, the brother

\* Unfortunately, since the following issue of the *New-York Gazette* is missing, it is impossible to tell whether or not the play was actually given.

of the British king, has been wounded in the head by Caesar's sword, the weapon sticks in his shield and is carried off by him. When he dies of the head wound a fortnight later and is buried at the North Gate of Trinovantum (London), Caesar's sword, called the Yellow Death because of its inevitable fatality, is buried with him.

When Spenser says that the sword is "yet to be seene this day," it is possible that he means in Prince Arthur's day; but his apostrophe to the Queen at the beginning of Canto X suggests that he is temporarily turning to the obverse of his allegory. Furthermore, if the sword had been buried, it was hardly visible: the statement seems definitely to refer to a special contemporary circumstance.

In Spenser's time Ludgate was decorated by three statues which represented King Lud and his two sons, one of them wearing a sword;<sup>1</sup> but even if Spenser had mistaken the two sons for Lud's brothers Cassibellaunus and Nennius, it is hard to believe that he had a stone sword in mind when he wrote the line in question. A more plausible hint as to what he meant appears in the fifteenth-century *Anonymi Chronicon Godstovianum* which Thomas Hearne published with his edition of Roper's *More* (1716): "Nennius frater Cassibulani regis eripuit gladium vel sicam de manu Julii, quae sica in hunc diem custoditur in turri London" (sg. Bb<sup>v</sup>). It is possible that the sword referred to here had no association with Nennius originally, for Caesar was popularly supposed, at least from the fourteenth century on, to have built the Tower of London,<sup>2</sup> and someone (perhaps with an eye to publicity) might have found an old blade there which, he concluded, had been left behind by the Roman conqueror. (For a similar Caesar tradition regarding the wine and salt in the Castle of Dover, see William Lambarde's *Perambulation of Kent*, 1826 ed., pp. 134-135.)

As for other allusions to the sword in Spenser's own time, it is tempting to think that Shakespeare had it in mind when he made Boyet say that Holofernes' face looks like the "pommel of Caesar's

<sup>1</sup> See Sir Walter Besant, *Early London* (1908), p. 19, and Charles L. Kingsford (ed.), *A Survey of London by John Stow* (Oxford, 1908), I, 38-39.

<sup>2</sup> See H. Nearing, "Julius Caesar and the Tower of London," *MLN*, LXXXI (1948), 228-233.

falchion" (*Love's Labour's Lost* v. ii. 615). 'This might be nothing more than an extravagant figure inspired by Longaville's previous comparison of the pedant's face to an old Roman coin; but the joke was certainly funnier if the audience got from it a picture of some worn antiquity in the Tower.

HOMER NEARING, JR.

*Pennsylvania Military College*

### A CHINESE SOURCE FOR MAUPASSANT

Maupassant's vivid tale called *Une Vendetta* was published in *le Gaulois* on Oct. 14, 1883. Was the plot the author's invention, a folk-tale, or a modern reproduction of an ancient literary theme? I know of no source that has been suggested. Both Mr. Artinian and Mr. Fess assure me that they have heard of none. I am consequently encouraged to propose that Maupassant's point of departure may have been a Chinese play.

Tou ngan cou, the King of Tsin's first war minister, gives the following account of his effort to kill Tchou tun, who governed the people:

Dans ce tems-là un Roi d'Occident offrit un grand chien qui avoit nom *Chin ngao*. Le Roi me le donna, & je formai le dessein de m'en servir pour faire mourir mon rival, j'enfermai le chien dans une chambre à l'écart; je défendis qu'on lui donnât à manger pendant quatre ou cinq jours. J'avois préparé dans le fond de mon jardin un homme de paille, habillé comme *Tchao*, & de sa grandeur: ayant mis dans son ventre des entrailles de mouton, je prens mon chien, je lui fais voir les entrailles, je le lâche il eût [*sic*] bientôt mis en pieces l'homme de paille, & dévoré la chair qu'il y trouva. Je le renferme dans sa prison, je le fais jeûner, & je le ramene au même endroit, si-tôt qu'il apperçut l'homme de paille, il se mit à aboyer, je le lâche, il déchire le fantôme, & mange les entrailles comme la première fois: cet exercice dura cent jours. au bout de ce tems-là je vais à la Cour, . . . dans ce moment *Tchao tun* étoit à côté du Roi avec ses habits ordinaires: si-tôt que *Chin ngao* le vit, il se mit à aboyer. . . Je le déliai; il poursuivit *Tchao tun* qui fuyoit de tous côtes dans la salle royale.

This account is found in the prologue of *Tchao chi cou ell*, le *petit Orphelin de la Maison de Tchao*, the 95th of the hundred best plays composed in the Yuan dynasty. In 1731 Father Prémare translated it into French.<sup>1</sup> His version was reproduced in Father

<sup>1</sup> MS. at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Réserve, anc. f. fr. 25510.

## EMILE ZOLA: FROM FACT TO FICTION

In *L'Événement* for April 19, 1866, Emile Zola published a short piece entitled *Un Suicide*, the story of a young painter who hangs himself in despair at having been rejected by the Salon. The little *conte*, which is not included in Zola's *Œuvres complètes* but which is sometimes cited as a kind of very short and undeveloped sketch of *L'Œuvre*,<sup>1</sup> would seem to be based on a real occurrence, the suicide of a young artist named Holtzapfel, which is reported in the *Petit Bulletin hebdomadaire* of *La Petite Revue* for April 21, 1866. The *Petite Revue* recounts his suicide after his rejection by the Jury and quotes portions of a letter he left explaining his act: "Les membres du Jury ne me connaissent pas . . . je n'avais parmi eux ni amis ni ennemis . . . il me refuse, donc je n'ai pas de talent . . . il faut mourir." Holtzapfel's suicide was the more newsworthy since he had had two paintings accepted by the Salon of 1864 and one by that of 1865, all of which had attracted favorable attention.<sup>2</sup>

The fact that Zola quite probably employed the circumstances of Holtzapfel's death in *Un Suicide* has a certain significance. It means that at the very time he was still at least partly in the realm of literary fantasy—*Un Suicide* appeared nearly a year before *Thérèse Raquin*, his first truly naturalistic work—he was already interested in the pursuit of the document, the 'fait-divers,' the 'chose vue.' We might note, too, that if he did borrow the story of his young artist's death from the columns of one of the journals or newspapers of the time, he changed it in a way that is already typical of the mature manner of the *Rougon-Macquart* series. Holtzapfel had in fact shot himself; Zola changes the manner of suicide to hanging, a good deal more effective means of dying as far as the story-teller is concerned, as a considerable number of writers since Villon's day have demonstrated. It might be noted, incidentally, that Claude Lantier, the unsuccessful painter of *L'Œuvre*, also hangs himself in despair at his human and artistic failure. Evidently Zola, who in 1866 still seemed to be a follower of Musset, was already in possession of the rudiments of the technique that

<sup>1</sup> John Rewald, *Cézanne et Zola*, Paris (Sedrowski), 1936, p. 132.

<sup>2</sup> *La Petite Revue*, x (10 Feb.-12 May, 1866), 168.

was to arouse such indignant cries from the Pontmartin's and the Brunetière's of twenty years later.

ROBERT J. NIESS

Harvard University

## COQUILLES

La *Correspondance* de Rousseau rend de grands services. C'est grâce à elle, par exemple, qu'on peut le mieux rendre compte des événements qui ont abouti à la condamnation de l'*Emile*. Mais les lettres de Rousseau nous renseignent aussi sur les coquilles qui ont été faites dans ses œuvres. C'est ainsi que Rousseau signale,<sup>1</sup> dans le texte des *Lettres de la Montagne*, une erreur qui se retrouve encore dans les éditions modernes. De même, on lit, dans la *Correspondance*, une lettre<sup>2</sup> de Duclos où celui-ci dit, à propos de la *Nouvelle Héloïse*: 'Mon plaisir va croissant, je vous réponds que je ne trouve pas l'ouvrage *feuillu*.' D'Escherny<sup>3</sup> avait aussi déclaré: 'Diderot n'a pu dire à Rousseau que comme il me l'a dit à moi (raisonnant avec lui sur le mérite de divers écrivains) *Feuillu* et non *Feuillet* qui n'a point de sens.'<sup>4</sup> Inutile de faire remarquer que cette mauvaise leçon est conservée par tous les éditeurs modernes.<sup>5</sup> Nous avons relevé une autre coquille. Il s'agit du récit de l'herborisation à la Robaila. Les éditions modernes donnent ce texte: 'à vingt pas du lieu même où je croyais être parvenu le premier, j'aperçois une manufacture de bas.'<sup>6</sup> Mais

<sup>1</sup> *Corr. gén.*, XII, 183. '*imprudence* pour *impudence*. Cette r est trop tuante.' L'erreur s'est pourtant maintenue (cf. *Œuvres*, éd. Hachette, III, 237).

<sup>2</sup> *Corr. gén.*, V, 261 (lettre écrite vers le 18 nov. 1760). Rousseau répondit (*ibid.*, p. 262). 'vous trouvez que le style n'est pas *feuillu* tant mieux.'

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Œuvres complètes de Diderot*, éd. J. Assézat & M. Tourneux (Paris, 1877), XX, 136-140.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 139. Cf. l'édition du *Discours sur les Sciences & les Arts* de G. R. Havens (New York, 1946), p. 21, n. 12. Balzac a dit: 'dans le récit de ces événements si nombreux, si feuillus, pour employer la célèbre expression de Diderot . . .' (M. Bardèche, *Stendhal*, Paris, 1947, p. 411).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Confessions*, éd. de la Pléiade (Paris, 1933), p. 356.

<sup>6</sup> *Confessions* . . . , éd. de la Pléiade, p. 725.

je relève *bois* au lieu de *bas*, dans une étude remarquable<sup>7</sup> qu'on a faite sur les *Rêveries d'un promeneur solitaire*.

MARCEL FRANÇON

Harvard University

### "MONOLOGUE INTÉRIEUR" IN 1845

The first use of the expression "monologue intérieur" is ascribed by Valéry Larbaud and Edouard Dujardin to Paul Bourget and is dated 1893.<sup>1</sup> Their citation comes from *Cosmopolis*, I, 40:

Ce petit monologue intérieur n'était pas très différent de celui qu'aurait prononcé dans une circonstance analogue n'importe quel jeune homme intéressé par une jeune fille dont la mère se conduit mal.

I have noticed that Alexandre Dumas père used the same expression in *Vingt Ans Après*, 1845, almost fifty years earlier. In the Dumas story, the Duc de Beaufort has just invited his jailer, an Exempt named La Ramée, to lunch with him on dainties that the latter was to bring in from a pastry shop near the Château de Vincennes. Dumas describes the reactions of the guard and his prisoner in these words:

Il réfléchit un instant; mais le résultat de ses réflexions fut qu'il commanderait les vivres et le vin, et que par conséquent aucune poudre ne serait semée sur les vivres, aucune liqueur ne serait mêlée au vin.

<sup>7</sup> R. Osmont, 'Contribution à l'étude psychologique des Rêveries du promeneur solitaire,' *Annales de la Société J.-J. Rousseau*, xxiii (1934) 82. Il ne peut s'agir d'une erreur, car R. Osmont étudie cette phrase de Rousseau et écrit deux fois le mot *bois*. F. Gaiffe ('J.-J. Rousseau. Rêveries . . . ' Cours professé à la Fac des Lettres de Paris [1928-29], fascicule v, 108) a dit. 'dans les chapitres que d'Escherny consacre à cette fameuse excursion, il donne toutes sortes de détails [ . . . ] mais quant à la fameuse fabrique [ . . . ] il n'y en a pas de trace'—Si l'expression *manufacture de bois* paraît étrange, on peut lui comparer celle qu'a employée Voltaire: 'les manufactures de soie' (*Siècle de Louis XIV*, chap. 29, p. 565 de l'édition Hachette), comme l'indique Littré. F. Berthoud, *J.-J. Rousseau au val de Travers* (Paris, 1881, p. 196): 'La présence d'une manufacture n'est pas non plus impossible. . . . Aujourd'hui on y rencontre des scieries et une fabrique de boîtes à musique.'

<sup>1</sup> E. Dujardin, *Le Monologue intérieur*, 32. Albert Messein, 1931.

Quand à le griser, le duc ne pouvait avoir une pareille intention, et il se mit à rire à cette seule pensée; puis une idée lui vint qui conciliait tout.

Le duc avait suivi le monologue intérieur de La Ramée d'un œil assez inquiet à mesure que le trahissait sa physionomie; mais enfin le visage de l'exempt s'éclaira.<sup>2</sup>

Bourget probably used his "petit monologue intérieur" as a psychological device, that of Dumas comes from stage language.

WM. LEONARD SCHWARTZ

Stanford University

---

## REVIEWS

*Heinrich von Kleist als politischer Dichter.* By HANS M. WOLFF.  
*University of California Publications in Modern Philology.*  
 XXVII, No. 6, pp. 343-521. 1947. \$3.00.

On the basis of Heinrich von Kleist's life, correspondence and literary works Professor Wolff has endeavored to portray the Prussian author's attitude toward society and the state. Such an undertaking seemed important because hitherto comments on Kleist's political views had been scattered and fragmentary, moreover, a study of this kind seemed to have historical value because of the light it might shed on Kleist's relation to his times.

The monograph presents material in chronological sequence under five headings: Der antisoziale Individualismus, based on early letters, *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, *Die Verlobung in St. Domingo*, *Das Erdbeben in Chili*, *Robert Guiscard*, and *Amphitryon*; Der liberale Individualismus, as found in *Der zerbrochene Krug*, *Michael Kohlhaas* and *Der Findling*; Individualismus und Kollektivismus as reflected in *Penthesilea*; Nationalismus as manifest in *Die Hermannsschlacht*; Ausgleich as revealed in *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*.

On the whole, the author has made a good case for the general trend of development indicated by these headings. This was not an easy undertaking, because Kleist remains one of the controversial figures in German literature of the nineteenth century.

Despite conflicting opinions held by some scholars, this reviewer is inclined to take issue with Professor Wolff who regards Kleist as a pronounced rationalist in his earlier years. It must be stressed that the ardent enthusiasm with which the young Kleist praised a life of reason had a very strong emotional tinge, and that he

<sup>2</sup> Edition Calmann-Lévy, I, 211.

accepted the philosophy of the enlightenment with a passionate fervor which would scarcely stamp him as the thoroughgoing rationalist that he fancied himself to be. Indeed, Professor Wolff inadvertently appears to be of this opinion himself when he states: "Aber seine eigene Natur spielte seiner rationalistischen Erhabenheit einen Streich" (p. 366). The author does not give sufficient weight to the irrational, emotional side of Kleist's temperament in those years when he took such delight in regarding himself fundamentally as a being whose thoughts and acts were dictated by cold, analytical reason alone.

The author asserts: "Rationalismus und Individualismus lassen sich nicht trennen, sie sind nur verschiedene Seiten derselben Einstellung" (p. 351). This sweeping statement overlooks the fact that in the history of philosophical thinking, rationalism and individualism were sometimes at variance with each other. If the implication is that irrationalism and individualism are incompatible, the statement is again open to challenge.

Of Kleist's drama *Penthesilea* Professor Wolff writes: "Die furchterliche Wut Penthesileas, ihre rasende Leidenschaft, ihr zum Äussersten aufgestachelter Zorn, alle diese Momente haben keine eigene Bedeutung und machen das Drama genau so wenig zu einem Drama der Leidenschaft, wie die Hexe in der *Familie Schroffenstein* die Tragödie zur Schicksalsdichtung macht; sie stellen einzig und allein die Folgen der Abweichung vom Gesetz dar und bereiten den notwendig gewordenen Untergang der Liebenden vor" (p. 456 f.). Here the author has probably narrowed his opinion too much in favor of his schematic trend of development. For throughout the drama Kleist portrayed a wide range of tempestuous, passionate emotions in the Amazon queen; they include feverish expectation, despair, bitterness, tenderness, rage, hatred, love, anguish, triumphant joy, exultation, momentary resignation, grief, dejection, defiance, ecstatic longing, hysteria, and insane cruelty. Such unbridled, violent, rapidly changing outbursts may well permit this tragedy to be designated as a drama of passion. And, indeed, this is the effect produced by the play on the stage.

In *Das Kathchen von Heubronn* Kleist does, not necessarily, as the author asserts, throw overboard his views on equality—"daß Kleist auf einmal auch das Prinzip über Bord wirft, daß ihm bisher so wichtig war: das Prinzip der Gleichheit" (p. 466). In this fanciful drama Kleist merely portrays distinctions of rank as being the accepted order of the day when medieval knighthood held the stage.

This reviewer regards Homburg as more impulsive and less calculating than Professor Wolff characterizes him (p. 498). The latter seems to limit the motives for Homburg's sudden attack pretty much to selfish ambitions. Nevertheless, the young prince's precipitate attack is due in part to his impulsiveness. Prior to



the battle the elector himself had warned Homburg, had reminded him of past impetuosity, and had commanded him to restrain himself. Furthermore, Professor Wolff says of the forbidden attack "sicher ist jedenfalls soviel, daß er kein Unheil angerichtet hat" (p. 498), and "daß der Führer der Reiterei trotz seines Ungehorsams letzten Endes nicht zu Ungunsten des allgemeinen Planes gearbeitet hat" (p. 504). Nevertheless, the elector asserts that Homburg's disobedience cost him a complete victory in which the enemy would have been annihilated (1537 ff.). Moreover, this assertion is not denied even by Kottwitz.

The statement "Aufs schärfste verurteilt Kleist (in *Die Familie Schroffenstein*) diesen absoluten Gehorsam, den er später im *Prinzen von Homburg* mit gleichem Eifer gutheißt" (p. 373), leads the reader to seek in vain for support of this declaration in the discussion of Kleist's last drama. This reviewer is at a loss to know how Kleist can so zealously approve absolute obedience in *Homburg* if this drama, as Professor Wolff convincingly states, represents a search for a balance between nationalism and individualism (p. 489). There seems to be no character who unequivocally serves as Kleist's mouthpiece to voice such eager approval.

There is considerable carelessness in proofreading and in the verification of quotations and references. Even a first reading disclosed forty typographical errors. Mistakes in quotations include failure to indicate stressed words, wrong punctuation, misspellings, faulty word order, and omissions of dots to indicate gaps in quoted sentences. These are minor faults which will not be listed here. A more serious flaw lies in the following incorrect references:

- p. 366, for (II, 78) read (II, 79)
- p. 371, n. 4, for (Berlin, 1915), S 77 read (München, 1925), S 105
- p. 384, mid, for (VI, 1) read (VI, 2)
- p. 386, for (VI, 10) read (VI, 11)
- p. 400, for (546) read (545)
- p. 440, for 1953 f. read 1954 f.
- p. 442, for (1957-1960) read (1957-1961)
- p. 474, for (vgl. oben S. 362) read (vgl. unten S. 362)
- p. 482, n. 4, for (VIII, 48 f.) read (VII, 49 f.)
- p. 483, for (226) read (II, 226)
- p. 484, bot., insert reference (VII, 98)
- p. 485, insert reference (VII, 102) at end of first paragraph
- p. 485 (VII, 131 f.) is not from "Proklamation" but from "Von den Maßregeln in Hinsicht auf Deutschland."
- p. 496, n. 9, for S 32 read S. 178
- In seven footnotes Kleistgesellschaft should read Kleist-Gesellschaft
- p. 506, n 17, s o S 44 presumably should read s o. S 381.

It should be said that in part the points at which the reviewer differs with the author are controversial; in part they represent minutiae and mechanical details of scholarly accuracy.

The author is well read in the critical literature on Kleist, his references to Rousseau, to Adam Müller's *Elemente der Staatskunst*

and to the teachings of Kleist's professor, Ludwig Gottfried Madihn, at the University of Frankfurt an der Oder provide significant comparisons. Important parallels between works of Kleist are brought out. The analysis of *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* is an excellent interpretation of a drama on which opinions of critics differ very widely. The style is clear, direct, and without mannerisms. Professor Wolff has written on an important subject and has presented it from fruitful points of view.

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL

Wesleyan University

---

*Die romantische Komodie und das deutsche Lustspiel*, von FRITZ GÜTTINGER, Wege zur Dichtung, Zürcher Schriften zur Literaturwissenschaft (Emil Ermatinger), Band xxxiv, Frauenfeld 1939. 272 pp.

*Hebbels dramatischer Stil*, von MARGA BÜHRIG, Wege zur Dichtung (etc.), Band xxxv, Frauenfeld 1940. 116 pp.

Wenn hier über zwei Arbeiten, die thematisch auf den ersten Blick so weit auseinander zu liegen scheinen, in einer gemeinsamen Besprechung berichtet wird, so geschieht das nicht, weil es sich um zwei während des Krieges erschienene Veröffentlichungen in derselben Schriftenreihe handelt, sondern weil beide sich mit verschiedenen Aspekten desselben Gegenstandes, des Hebbelschen Werkes nämlich, beschäftigen. Während Marga Bührigs Arbeit sich dabei in eng abgesteckten Grenzen bewegt, ist die Untersuchung Güttingers, von Hebbels frühen Komödien ausgehend, in ein weites und komplexes Thema hineingewachsen—in vielleicht eines der wichtigsten, sicherlich eines der interessantesten Phänomene der modernen deutschen Literatur.

Marga Bührigs Darstellung der dramatischen Sprache Hebbels ist eine kompetente, wenn auch vielleicht ein wenig zu angstlich am Gegenstand haftende Arbeit, die, wie die Verfasserin einleitend erklärt, aus einem Vortrag im Seminar Emil Ermatingers hervorgegangen ist. Der besondere Stil Hebbels wird von ihr in erster Linie aus Hebbels Charakter, sein dichterischer aus seinem menschlichen Stil abgeleitet. Das liegt ja im Grunde auf der Hand, viel welterschütternd Neues liess sich von einem so konservativen Unternehmen nicht gut erwarten. Nur in einem kurzen Mittelstück von 13 Seiten, in dem (an sich auch wieder naheliegende) stilvergleichende Ausblicke auf Schiller und Kleist getan werden, wird die methodische Enge des eigentlichen Arbeitsgebietes

einigermassen gesprengt; obgleich auch diese viel zu knappen Ausblicke nicht recht befriedigen, so hätte man doch gewünscht, dass diese so viel fruchtbareren Stilvergleichen zum Ausgangspunkt der Arbeit genommen worden wären. Die Arbeit hatte dann zu einem bedeutsamen Beitrag zur Phänomenologie des dramatischen und dichterischen Stiles überhaupt werden können, anstatt letzten Endes in den psychologischen Gegebenheiten der Hebbelschen Biographiae hängen zu bleiben, und sich mit der Beweisführung kaum noch zu beweisender Probleme zu begnügen.

Fritz Güttingers Untersuchung dagegen ist ganz augenscheinlich das Werk eines Kritikers, der mit seinem Gegenstand gewachsen ist. Von einer Analyse der Hebbelschen Lustspiele ausgehend, ist er zunächst auf die engen Beziehungen zwischen Hebbels Theorien und denen der Romantiker gestossen, was ihn wiederum zu der Frage führte, inwiefern diese sich von der traditionellen Lustspieltheorie des Abendlandes unterscheiden. Man sieht also auf den ersten Blick, wie hier eine geistig-raumlich begrenzte Einzeluntersuchung auf eins der Hauptprobleme der deutschen Dichtung vorgestossen ist. Denn die Frage, warum die deutsche Literatur so arm geblieben ist an wirklich grossen Lustspielen, und dies bei einer gleichzeitigen Fülle von theoretischen Proklamationen und Diskussionen, ist wirklich von zentraler Bedeutung, und bei ihrer Beantwortung müssen notwendig wesentliche Beobachtungen über die verhängnisvolle Rolle der Romantik für den organischen Fortgang der deutschen Literatur zur Sprache kommen. Ein Vergleich der deutschen romantischen Lustspiele mit der alten Komödienliteratur einerseits, aber auch mit der anderer Völker, besonders der englischen, lag natürlich nahe. Und dabei sei gleich betont, dass Güttingers Untersuchung glücklicherweise von einer gründlichen Kenntnis nicht nur der deutschen sondern auch der nicht-deutschen Komödie getragen ist. Es ist schon an sich ein Genuss besonderer Art, einer Diskussion beizuwohnen, die derart in jedem Augenblick aus dem Vollen zu schöpfen vermag, und die in ihren besten Momenten zu scharfen und treffenden Formulierungen führt, in denen das Gesagte geradezu bildhaft hervortritt.<sup>1</sup> So etwa, wenn der Verfasser die ästhetisierenden und ganz im Individuellen aufgehenden Tendenzen der Romantiker mit der soziologisch bedingten traditionellen Komödie vergleicht und schreibt: "Das Wortspiel der Romantiker ist seines rechtmässigen komischen Amtes enthoben, es ist Ausdruck eines Zustandes geistiger Übersättigung, der die Mittel der Sprache wahllos verschleudert, weil nicht mehr allzu viel Wirklichkeitsgehalt daran haftet, und die Wörter, von ihrer gesell-

<sup>1</sup> Der Vollständigkeit halber wäre freilich auch zu erwähnen, dass Güttinger gelegentlich von einem zu ausschliesslich schweizerischen Vokabular in die Enge getrieben wird, und dass er einmal (S. 139) von der Selbstverspottung "des . . . mit dergleichen Dingen abgespiessenen Träumers" spricht: "speissen" ist immer noch ein schwaches Verb!

schaftlichen Dienstleistung befreit, gleichsam arbeitslos sind. Ihre wortspielerischen Exzesse sind Arbeitslosenkundgebungen dienstentlassener Wörter, weit entfernt von jeder Absicht komischer Gestaltung." Weniger glücklich sind fraglos andere Pointierungen und Zusammendrängungen, die letztlich auf eine unhaltbare Verallgemeinerung hinauslaufen, so etwa wenn es von dem "allgemeinen Charakter der Romantik" heisst, er wäre eine "Übersteigerung der Klassik"; man glaubt Korffsche und ähnliche Gedankengänge durchzuhören, die deswegen nicht als Ergebnisse sondern als Angelesenes wirken.

Die dem Buch zugrunde liegenden Erkenntnisse liessen sich etwa folgendermassen kurz zusammenfassen: während die traditionelle und traditionsverwachsene europäische Komödie eine bestimmte soziologische Funktion hatte, die das Handlungselement in den Vordergrund schob, verdrängten die Romantiker den komischen Konflikt aus dem Realen ins Metaphysische. Nicht mehr endliche sondern unendliche Perspektiven öffneten sich ihm in der Komödie, die damit aus einer menschlichen zu einer menscheitlichen "Komödie" wurde. Nicht die Tatsache, dass die Romantiker die Literaturkomödie und die literarische Persiflage literaturfähig machten, war für diese Neuorientierung entscheidend, da in ihnen immerhin noch das Kernelement der Handlung unangestastet bliebe, sondern vielmehr die Verschiebung des Konflikts ins Innere des Ich, wo nur noch ein endliches Ich mit seinem unendlichen Spiegelbild in "komischen" Konflikt geraten könne. Dadurch, dass sie das Komische ins Metaphysische abgedreht hatten, hatten sie es gleichzeitig seiner gesellschaftlichen und damit seiner wahren komischen Funktion beraubt; das Komische wurde somit zum "Heiteren" und Lyrischen, dann zum Märchenhaften und zur Musik, so dass man mit Recht "vom Tod der Komödie aus dem Geist der Musik" sprechen könne. Eine ähnliche Entwicklung liesse sich natürlich auch für den deutschen Roman aufzeigen, worauf der Verfasser nur mit einer gelegentlichen Bemerkung (S. 209) hinzuweisen Gelegenheit findet, was aber die grundlegende Bedeutung dieser Linienführung noch betont. Hebbel, der gemeinhin in realistischen und nicht in romantischen Perspektiven gesehen wird, gibt sich in seinen Ideen zur Komödie durchaus als Erbe der Romantik zu erkennen. Es ist Güttinger gelungen, hier eine überzeugende Entwicklungslinie aufzuzeigen, die von Friedrich Schlegel (und zum Teil schon von Schiller) bis zu Hebbel hinüberführt. Das sind Verdienste, die nicht zu gering anzuschlagen sind.

WOLFGANG PAULSEN

*Smith College*

---

*Der Traum in der Dichtung der deutschen Romantik*, von PAULA RITZLER. Paul Haupt, Bern, 1943; 75 pp.

*Das Bild der Schweiz in der deutschen Romantik*, von ALFRED LIEBI. (*Sprache und Dichtung*, Heft 71). Paul Haupt, Bern, 1946; xv + 191 pp.

Es ist fraglos richtig, daß die fruhe Romantik nicht mit denselben Kategorien zu erfassen ist wie die späte. Nach der Bedeutung des Traumes für die deutschen Romantiker fragen, heißt deswegen, wie es scheint, wesentliche Gebiete romantischen Denkens—und auch Dichtens!—beiseite lassen. Den Traum außerdem als ein zentrales Element der Romantik nehmen hat auf den ersten Blick etwas Amatearisches, gegen das man sich instinktiv zu wehren geneigt ist. Umso überraschender ist es deswegen zu finden, daß es Paula Ritzler trotz allem gelungen ist, auf engstem Raume eine durchaus kultige Entwicklungslinie aufzuzeigen und ihre Argumente mit einer kritischen Scharfe vorzubringen, die schon an sich ein nicht gerade häufiger Genuß ist. Von Novalis über Hoffmann, Tieck, Kleist, Eichendorff bis zu Keller (in dieser Reihenfolge) untersucht sie die Rolle, die der Traum in der Dichtung dieser repräsentativen Romantiker (resp. Frührealisten) gespielt hat. Da der Traum ja nichts anderes ist als eine invertierte Ausdrucksform der Wirklichkeit, läuft eine derartige Fragestellung notwendig auf eine Darstellung des Wirklichkeitsgehaltes der betreffenden Werke hinaus.

Es ist kaum notwendig zu betonen, daß die Verdienste der vorliegenden Arbeit nicht in neuen Einzelergebnissen und nicht einmal in überraschenden neuen Schlußfolgerungen bestehen, sondern viel mehr in ihren eindringlichen, präzisen und gerade deswegen doch auch immer wieder überraschenden und stimulierenden Formulierungen. Mit ungewöhnlicher Klarheit ist hier Wesentliches herausgearbeitet und mit souveräner Behandlung des Materials gedeutet worden.

Die Aufgabe, die sich die Verfasserin gestellt hat besteht darin, den sich wandelnden Wirklichkeitsgehalt der deutschen romantischen Dichtungsgeschichtlich einzuordnen. Der Weg von Novalis zu Keller, von der frühen Romantik bis zum frühen Realismus, stellt sich, in diesem Lichte gesehen, als ein progressiver Veraußerlichungsprozeß in der Haltung zum Traum dar, von einer—sagen wir: idealistisch bewerteten Traumwirklichkeit bei Novalis, über einen immer intensiver empfundenen Bruch zwischen Traum und Wirklichkeit bei Hoffmann und Tieck, dann einer erneuten ernsthaften Auseinandersetzung mit dem Problem bei Kleist und einem Absinken ins Aesthetische bei Eichendorff (wo aus dem "Traum" das "Träumerische" wird), bis schließlich zu der Überwindung des Traums—der Abkehr vom Traum—zugunsten der harten Wirklichkeit bei Keller.

Fraglich ist bei diesem an sich so zwingenden Überblick vor allem die rein historische Einordnung Kleists, der ja doch in viel frühere Zusammenhänge gehört (in die Sturm und Drang-Erbschaft nämlich) und bestimmt nicht so einfach als Reaktionserscheinung auf Tieck gedeutet werden darf.

Auf der anderen Seite wäre es nun auch interessant gewesen zu erfahren, wie die anderen untergeordneteren Romantiker sich zu dem jeweiligen Stande der in diesen Werken gestalteten Traumwirklichkeit verhalten haben. Denn nur so ließe sich feststellen, ob es sich hier im Ganzen um rein individuelle Prägungen allein handelt, oder ob diese als wirklich gultige und repräsentative Erscheinungen innerhalb der Geistesgeschichte ihrer Zeit zu werten sind.

Während die Ritzlersche Arbeit sich in knappen, scharfen Linien mit einem der Zentralprobleme der Romantik beschäftigt, untersucht Alfred Liebi ausführlicher und auch ausschweifender eines der vielen Randprobleme der Romantik, nämlich das Verhältnis der (vor allem deutschen) Schweiz zur deutschen Romantik. Er geht diesen Wechselbeziehungen in beiderseitiger Richtung nach: einmal indem er das aufzeigt, was die Schweiz den deutschen Romantikern gewesen ist, und dann indem er die Einflüsse der Romantik auf die Schweiz darstellt. Im Zentrum der Eindrücke, die von der Schweiz auf die Romantik ausgeübt wurden (abgesehen von den rein landschaftlichen und politischen) steht ihm die Gestalt Johannes von Müllers; aber auch die Beziehungen zu Gessner, Pestalozzi, Mme de Staël, Bodmer und Karl Ludwig von Haller, die bekanntlich keineswegs immer positive waren, werden berücksichtigt. Am interessantesten an der ganzen Untersuchung ist vielleicht der Nachweis, wie spurlos im Grunde die Romantik an der Schweiz vorbeigegangen ist. In den drei Teilen des Buches (I. Die Literatur, II. Das Volk, III. Das Land) hat Liebi diese Wechselbeziehungen erschöpfend dargetan.

WOLFGANG PAULSEN

Smith College

*Der moderne deutsche Bildungsroman.* von BERTA BERGER.  
(*Sprache und Dichtung*, Heft 69), Paul Haupt, Bern, 1942.  
x + 73 pp.

Den deutschen Bildungs- und Erziehungsroman behandeln heißt beinahe schon die Frage nach dem deutschen Roman überhaupt aufwerfen. Für den Kritiker hat das seine Vor- wie Nachteile. Einerseits scheint diese für die deutsche Literatur so bezeichnende Synonymität der Begriffe das Problem freilich zu vereinfachen: der große deutsche Roman ist eben Bildungs- oder Erziehungsroman. Auf der anderen Seite aber wird es ja gerade durch diese anscheinende Vereinfachung so ungeheuer komplex. Eben weil es kaum

möglich ist, eine eindeutig feststehende Tradition herauszugreifen—eine neben vielen anderen—und sie als die des Bildungs- und Erziehungsromans abzustechen, um sie am Ende nach ihren eigenen Gesetzen zu messen und zu bewerten, ist es so wichtig, zunächst die Begriffsbestimmungen bis ins einzelne hinein festzulegen und überhaupt die systematischen Vorarbeiten mit ganz besonderer Sorgfalt durchzuführen. Es genügt keineswegs, sich privatum und seinem eigenen Geschmack gehorchend Grenzen zu setzen, um dann innerhalb derer eine Auswahl zu treffen, die mit dem Etikett "Bildungs- und Erziehungsroman" versehen als eine wirklich gegebene Einheit behandelt werden könnte. Die Frage nach dem Sinn dieser vielleicht deutschesten Kunstform muß von Periode zu Periode jedesmal wieder neu gestellt und gelöst, ihren Bedingungen muß historisch und soziologisch (denn es handelt sich ja doch in erster Linie um ein soziologisches Problem!) nachgegangen werden, wobei es zunächst beinahe uninteressant ist zu wissen, welches Werk letztlich in dieser Tradition zu sehen wäre und welches nicht.

Eine ganze Reihe wichtiger Vorarbeiten sind auf diesem Gebiet bereits geleistet worden, mit denen sich der Fragestellende aufs lebhafteste auseinandersetzen hat. Erwähnt seien hier nur die Untersuchungen von Melitta Gerhard und E. L. Stahl—denen dann in gehörigem Abstand weitere folgen. (Berta Berger scheint von den meisten dieser Arbeiten nichts zu wissen). Mit anderen Worten, derjenige der nach dem Bildungsroman in der modernen deutschen Dichtung fragt, kann sich hier auf Wesentliches stützen, aber doch ohne die Ergebnisse dieser Vorarbeiten mehr oder weniger als unumstößliche Autoritäten hinnehmen zu dürfen.

Eine derartige Auseinandersetzung mit dem Problem selbst aber bietet die vorliegende Arbeit leider nicht. Wahrscheinlich fehlt es dieser an sich fleißigen und intelligenten Darstellung hauptsächlich an kritischem Abstand, sodaß sich die Verfasserin unvermeidlich in der Masse moderner Romanliteratur verlaufen mußte. Auf den rund 75 Seiten ist wirklich beinahe alles vertreten, was der deutsche Roman seit dem Naturalismus geleistet hat—aber nichts ist wirklich untersucht, geschweige denn ausgeschöpft worden. Für ein so zentrales Werk wie den *Zauberberg* etwa haben gerade zwei Seiten zur Verfügung gestanden—und diese zwei Seiten bleiben ganz an der Oberfläche. Es wäre bestimmt besser gewesen, wenn die Verfasserin sich mit der Analyse einiger weniger Werke begnügt hätte anstatt sich mit derartig vagen Umrissen zufrieden zu stellen. Da alles letzten Endes im luftleeren Raum schwebt, mußten auch die all diesen Romanen etwas von außen her aufgezwungenen Kategorien (die zudem zu sehr nach dem primitiven Gliederungsschema von "Römisch I, römisch II, römisch III" schmecken) im Grunde belanglos bleiben.

Es soll hier gar nicht ins Einzelne gegangen werden. Es gäbe viele Fragen wie die, ob etwa Rilkes *Malte Laurids Brigde* oder

Carossas autobiographische Erzählungen wirklich *eo ipso* als Bildungsromane angesprochen werden können. Das wäre zum mindesten zu beweisen oder doch zu erklären gewesen!

Auf der anderen Seite aber ist es nur gerecht, daran zu erinnern, daß die Verfasserin sich mit einem zwar außerordentlich wichtigen aber doch auch höchst undankbaren Gegenstand beschäftigt hat. Sicherlich ist es zu rechtfertigen, wenn die Masse des Materials zuerst einmal zusammengetragen und gesichtet wird—und gerade das ist hier auf so beschränktem Raume auf anzuerkennende Weise geschehen. Umso bedauerlicher ist es aber doch wieder, daß so gar nicht der Versuch gemacht worden ist, gründlicher vorzugehen und tiefer zu sehen.

WOLFGANG PAULSEN

Smith College

---

*Deutsches Literatur-Lexikon. Biographisches und bibliographisches Handbuch* von DR. WILHELM KOSCH. Zweite, vollständig neu bearbeitete und stark erweiterte Auflage, A. Francke AG., Verlag. Bern, 1947. 1. 2. Lieferung (A—Bleibtreu) 176 pp. lex., 8<sup>vo</sup>. Fr. 12.

This new edition of Kosch's *Handbuch*, which first appeared in 1928-1930, is a welcome addition to our tools. When complete it is to comprise three volumes, in about thirty fascicles, appearing at intervals of about three months. As the title indicates, the *Handbuch* is not only biographic, but also bibliographic. Furthermore, it includes not only German literary authors of high and low degree, but also scholars and literary historians. Accordingly we find, in alphabetical order, such names as Johannes Aal, Friedrich Aarau, Thomas Abbt, Bernhard Abeken, Bernhard Rudolf Abeken, Hedwig von Abeken, Hans Karl Abel, Heinrich Abel, Jakob Friedrich von Abel, Kaspar Abel, Johann Martin Abele, Abraham a Sancta Clara, Abrahamson (Otto Brahm). Woven into the same alphabet is a subject index, giving names of persons and places treated in German literature, as well as literary genres, etc. For example: Aachen, Aarau, Abraham, Achilles, Achtundvierziger, Ahasverus, Alamode-Literatur, Alliterationsvers, J. S. Bach, Ballade, Barbarossa, Barockdichtung, Bartholomäusnacht, Beethoven, Biedermeier. Under these and similar headings are cited works dealing with the topics concerned: the entries range from four lines upward. As many as eleven pages are devoted to Berlin, largely made up of lists of novels, most of whose titles do not reveal at all that they deal with this city; for example: E. Th. A. Hoffmann, *Ritter Gluck: Abenteuer der Sylvesternacht*; Wilh. Hauff, *Mitteilungen aus den*



*Memoiren des Satans*; W. Alexis, *Cabanis*. Doubtless this voluminous list can be supplemented by other readers.

The work is well printed in a small but clear type. A few corrections may not be out of place: p. 20 Albrecht von Eyb should be entered under Eyb, instead of Albrecht, similarly p. 151 Bernhard von Breidenbach; p. 25 Nicolai's *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek* does not comprise "im ganzen etwa 200 Bande," but exactly 256 volumes, plus the rare index, in quarto: *Die Mitarbeiter an Fr. Nicolai's A. d. B. 1775-1806*, Berlin 1842; p. 33 under Amerika, read Horatio S. White, instead of Horazio S. White; p. 35 under Anakreontik, read Gresset instead of Gressel; p. 40 under Anonymus: an additional (seventh) volume of the *Deutsches Anonymen-Lexikon* appeared in 1928, p. 61 under Berthold Auerbach: his first work should have been listed: *Friedrich der Große, König von Preußen. Sein Leben und Wirken . . . von Theobald Chauber*, Stuttgart, 1834; p. 85 under Balhorn: read: Balhorn (nicht Ballhorn); p. 100 under Basile: it should be added that also Wieland's *Pervonte*, as its title-page indicates, goes back to the Pentameron; p. 123 under Behrend, Friedrich: the scholar thus designated always wrote and signed his name as Fritz Behrend, he died on March 14, 1939; p. 161 under Bible: as long as a number of pamphlets dealing with the pre-Lutheran Bible are mentioned, it would be in order to cite also the new edition: *Die erste deutsche Bibel*, 10 volumes, Tübingen, Litterarischer Verein, 1903-1916.

W. KURRELMAYER

---

*Papers Read before the Society in 1945*. Edited by L. A. WILLOUGHBY (Publications of the English Goethe Society. New Series. Vol. xv) Cardiff 1946. 138 pp.

The lamented Professor Hermann Georg Fiedler, to whose memory this volume, slim in appearance but weighty in content, is dedicated, would have been justly proud to receive such a harvest from seeds he had a large share in planting. With the exception of Professor Edna Purdie's essay, which compares the diaries of Hebbel and Grillparzer in regard to their differences of introspection and observation and thus throws new light on their manner of conceiving and producing, the papers of this volume are concerned with major problems of the *Goetheforschung* and major works of Goethe.

Miss Dorothy L. Sayers, in "The Faust Legend and the Idea of the Devil," discusses the danger in modern literature of conceding the devil too much sympathy. While in the Faust legend, in Marlow, and Milton he was clearly the prince of darkness, the later *Byronic set-up* has blurred that conception and it is still weakened,

to a certain extent at least, when Goethe allows evil to be the occasion of good. "What is getting lost is the sense of finality of choice, and of the reality and evilness of evil," which she finds most clearly expressed in Dante. Her identification of the *Byronic set-up* of the Devil with that of the Sturm und Drang seems to me unjustified although the conception of the Devil is not the same in all scenes of the *Urfaust*, as for instance in the Katechisationsscene and Nacht, Offen Feld. But this is only a minor point of a problem on which the author of *The Devil to Pay* may well speak with authority.

Professor Willoughby's masterly essay on "The Image of the Horse and Charioteer in Goethe's Poetry" is not just an interesting collection of examples of Goethe's imagery but reveals the very heartbeat of his production, nay, of his experiencing. The primordial image of the horse recurs through Goethe's whole life, and in its constant metamorphosis, coupled with associated concepts like that of the Hutte, mirrors the changes he undergoes and marks the periods of his development. The import and meaning of poetic symbolism, which the author discusses in his introduction, could not be illustrated more lucidly. I regret that Professor Willoughby did not include in his comprehensive list that childlike stage of the rocking horse in Goethe's letter of June 27, 1770 where he uses the image to describe the youthful gropings of his love just before his heart really bursts into flame and at the moment when he is about to find his own poetic voice (literally and metaphorically speaking) in the Wertherian account of his ride through the Lorraine mountain side.

Professor E. L. Stahl, in his very concise article "Die Wahlverwandtschaften," maintains convincingly that the work is not a didactic novel, that in contrast to Goethe's earlier works it involves not human error but a moral question of human guilt. "Goethe reveals in a single case the acceptance of the social law in preference to the natural, the choice of duty before inclination." Otilie is the real hero of the novel and her "self-fulfilment consists in her ability to harmonize the spiritual and physical laws within herself. In this respect she is superior to each of the other characters." To allow for Ottilie's growth Goethe had to turn the novelle into a novel and seen from this angle the often criticised "excrescences" of the work appear indispensable and organic.

Miss Elizabeth M. Wilkinson develops from a hitherto neglected trait in Goethe's characterization of Tasso an important argument for the interpretation of the drama and especially for its ending. In spite of Freytag's contention that the artist is not a suitable hero for presentation in a drama, Goethe succeeded in showing us Tasso in moments of poetic conception (see ll. 530 ff., 978 f., 3140 ff.). Tasso creates visions of universal validity and appeal, which differ from personal poetic images used by the other characters of the

drama as well as from those in Tasso's monologues. These only distort reality under the compulsion of his emotions. "The power by which he creates and which is his strength, this same power, used inappropriately, is his undoing, and again it is the same power which brings him release," namely the realization of his poetic gift at the moment when he comes face to face with his tragic fate as a man.

The reviewer's brief résumé cannot do justice to Miss Wilkinson's penetrating and subtle argumentation, nor, in fact, to any of the articles summed up here. They are required reading for any student of German classical literature.

ERNST FEISE

*Das europäische Volksmärchen: Form und Wesen.* By MAX LÜTHI.  
Bern: A. Francke Verlag, 1947. Pp. 127. Swiss fcs. 7. 80.

This brilliant endeavor to discover and describe the peculiar qualities that set *Märchen* apart from other genres of folk literature marks a definite advance in our understanding of them. Lüthi limits himself to European texts because non-European tales belong to many categories and have special characteristics of their own, and he does not deal, except incidentally, with questions of origin and dissemination. According to his conception, *Märchen* represent a highly sophisticated genre belonging to a fully developed culture. The fact does not prevent us from carrying their history back into Indogermanic times or even earlier (p. 118), but such theorizing does not particularly concern him.

Lüthi characterizes *Märchen* by direct statements supported by examples and by comparisons with legends and *Sagen*. (1) I shall cite a few of his direct statements to show his procedure. The *Märchen* is one-dimensional, that is, it knows nothing of a numinous Other World differing in its nature from the world of reality. Dragons, witches, or other supernatural creatures may help or hinder the hero, but they arouse no mysterious fear or curiosity. What fear or curiosity that may be present concerns the outcome of an event and not its nature. Since *Märchen* make no difference between the real and the supernatural worlds, the narrator often separates them by a long journey or some other physical barrier. (2) *Märchen* lack depth, that is, they do not give physical or spiritual fullness and roundness to objects or persons. The narrator does not tell the name or the effects of the illness from which a sick princess suffers. No blood flows from a wound, and the loss of a finger causes neither pain nor difficulty. Emotions are mentioned only when they bear directly on the action and are then expressed in acts. There is no passing of time in *Märchen*: no one grows

old or changes. Family relationships, although mentioned, do not reach below the surface: parents or brothers and sisters disappear when they have made their contribution to the action. (3) The style is abstract and characterized by formulas, conventional introductions and conclusions, and lack of shading. Each episode stands for itself and can therefore be repeated. Everything is conceived in terms of a single quality and then in an extreme degree. Contrasts abound.

Such observations are extremely helpful and lead us to see more clearly the nature of *Marchen*. Luthi draws very few inferences from his description of the genre. Perhaps the most interesting and important one is that *Marchen* are *Wunschkichtung* in only a very limited sense. Although the world described in *Marchen* is the opposite of our real world of uncertainties, confusions, and fears, the wishes satisfied in *Marchen* are not the needs and deprivations of daily life. Consequently, *Marchen* are not *Armeleutedichtung*.

These are but a few of the ideas set forth by Luthi. They are supported by an abundance of examples. His book gives a first impression of simplicity, but any effort to restate his ideas will demonstrate that appearances are deceptive.

ARCHER TAYLOR

*University of California, Berkeley*

*Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Discours sur les Sciences et les Arts.*

Edition critique avec une introduction et un commentaire par  
GEORGE R. HAVENS. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1946. Pp. xiii + 278. \$3.00.

It had been more or less a routine affair—that essay competition sponsored by the Academy of Dijon. But its outcome was epoch-making. Thirteen contestants had submitted papers on the topic proposed: “Whether the reestablishment of arts and sciences has contributed to the refining of manners.” Of the two who chose to defend the negative, one, a somewhat frustrated man of thirty-eight, manipulated the subject to suit himself. And his essay was declared the unanimous choice. The Academy knew not what it wrought—that Sunday afternoon, in August, 1750. In awarding to Jean-Jacques Rousseau a gold medal worth thirty *pistoles*, it changed Rousseau, it changed France, it changed the intellectual history of the world.

From that day to this, Rousseau and his “system,” to which the prize-winning First Discourse was basic, have left few readers indifferent. Man and writings have been a source of endless controversy and perennial discussion. A staggering mass of books

and articles, much of it highly polemical, has grown up around this provocative character. In the writings down the years, especially in those of his bitter enemies and of his fervent disciples, it has often been exceedingly difficult to separate the authentic from the legendary, to distinguish fact from fiction. Particularly was this the case before the present century. Now the picture is being brought into focus. Albert Schinz, in his *Etat présent des travaux sur J.-J. Rousseau*, has pointed out that, while fairly regular "waves" of literary warfare over Rousseau are to be observed from around 1760 through 1912—year of the bi-centennial celebration of the author's birth, the trend in the years following this occasion seems to be in the direction of greater detachment and more scholarly objectivity. Certain it is that since 1912 a good many solid and objective studies have been made. A number could be cited. By way of illustration it will suffice to mention the work of Vaughan, Masson, Mornet, the publication of Courtois' *Chronologie*, Dufour's *Correspondance générale* of Rousseau, and Schinz's *La Pensée de Jean-Jacques Rousseau*. Much, however, remains to be done. And especially needed are critical editions of some of the most important of the author's writings. Professor Havens has now supplied the want as regards the *First Discourse*.

Rousseau's frontal attack on the arts and sciences precipitated a vehement and long-drawn conflict, a barrage of accusations and refutations. Charges were piled on charges. Rousseau would have them burn the libraries. Rousseau's paradoxical stand was actually suggested to him by Diderot. Rousseau was guilty of plagiarism. What is the part of truth in all this? A number of studies have been made on various aspects of this *Discours*, including several by Professor Havens. But a comprehensive examination has long been awaited. Entirely familiar with any and all work of importance already done, admirably prepared for the task by long researches in the literature of eighteenth-century France, Professor Havens, out of his sure erudition, has made in his study of this first important philosophical work of Rousseau a signal contribution to Rousseau scholarship and to a better understanding of the man himself. His critical edition of the *Discours sur les Sciences et les Arts* is a distinguished addition to the company of noteworthy and objective publications to which reference has been made above.

In a commendable organization of his materials, Professor Havens has neatly set forth everything necessary to the history and an appreciation of the *Discours*. The Introduction is itself a fine running critique of the *Discours*. The text reproduced here is that of the original edition published at Geneva in 1750. Its pages are unincumbered except for occasional variants given in footnotes. An exhaustive *Commentaire* on the text follows. With its copious citations, display of sources and relevant matters, this *Commentaire* serves also as a solid buttress for the Introduction.

An *Appendice* contains an "Essai de classement des premières éditions" of the work. Abundant cross-references and a thorough Index heighten the book's effectiveness. The painstaking documentation of this edition, written in impeccable French, is everywhere apparent. Fair and unbiased, it is not only a scholarly introduction to a highly controversial figure but also to many of the great problems which beset the Age of Reason.

Rousseau's philippic against the sciences and arts was, concludes the author, his own idea. His "état d'âme" prior to the composition of the *Discours* pointed almost inevitably to the position finally assumed. "Diderot encourage Rousseau à concourir pour le prix de Dijon et le confirme dans son penchant naturel pour la réponse négative." But Diderot's influence was "moins influence d'idées que vigoureuse impulsion première." It becomes quite obvious that the Genevan's eloquent and concentrated attack, and the polemics which followed, were in truth only a "vieille querelle réchauffée." Of far greater significance than the question of its inspiration was the effect of the prize-winning essay and the ensuing quarrel on its author himself, for Professor Havens believes in the essential unity of Rousseau's thought: his polemical talents were developed; he was obliged henceforth to express his thoughts more succinctly; the way was prepared for the *Second Discours*; the "grand système" was already beginning to take shape.

In spite of its contradictions, its exaggerations, and its weaknesses, there are, as Professor Havens makes eminently clear, many lasting and meaningful truths in the *Discours sur les Sciences et les Arts*. And one of the greatest of these is that "le progrès matériel sans le progrès moral est un leurre."

PAUL M. SPURLIN

*University of Michigan*

---

*Leconte de Lisle's Poems on the Barbarian Races.* By ALISON FAIRLIE. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1947. Pp. xvi + 426.

Leconte de Lisle has placed under the title *Poèmes Barbares* a very heterogeneous collection of poems. It is true that they form a parallel volume to the *Poèmes Antiques*, but as a good many of the poems had been already composed for different occasions and in different moods without any thought of classification, it is not likely as Miss Fairlie states, "that the title *Barbares* was chosen primarily to represent a contrast between barbarism and the Greek ideal." Whereas it is true that *Barbares* is a title of "colour and character" which covers a wide variety of subjects, I am inclined to believe that Leconte de Lisle was guided by a certain amount of opportunism in choosing it. At no time does the term seem so

popular as between the time of the composition of Chateaubriand's *Études historiques*, a chapter of which bears the title *Mœurs des Barbares*, and Littré's book, *Études sur les Barbares et le Moyen Âge*. It is a term that is on the lips of catholic writers such as de Broglie and Montalembert, and of other authors like Flaubert, Quinet, Renan, and Ampère who speaks of "chants païens et barbares" in his comparison of the *Edda* with the *Niebelungen*.

Miss Fairlie shows in her excellent book to what extent Leconte de Lisle was part and parcel of his own generation in that he expressed in poetic form in *Les Poèmes Barbares* the historical interests of his contemporaries. She has diligently searched for every pebble that has gone into the making of Leconte de Lisle's extensive mosaics. The citation of the titles will indicate the breadth of the material she covered: "The Egyptian Poems," "The Finnish Poems," "The Scandinavian Poems," "The Celtic Poems," "The Polynesian Poems," "The Biblical Poems," "The Poems on the Cid and on Don Pèdre," "The Arab Poems," "The Poems on the Red Indians." In order to give an idea of the depth of her study, it is sufficient to say that each individual poem in the group is analyzed from the point of view of source, content, historical and poetic value. Vianey's investigation in the light of Miss Fairlie's discoveries appears certainly as an oversimplification. Her book shows to what extent one must be a non-specialist in order to be a specialist. Her book, while dealing with only a portion of Leconte de Lisle's production, serves to give an excellent idea of the mid-nineteenth century intellectual interests. I must admit, however, that the poetic element gets buried under this avalanche of material, and that there is lacking what a Baudelaire would consider most original in Leconte de Lisle's creative art.

Leconte de Lisle was not, of course, a historian in the modern sense. If he documented himself as thoroughly as he could and believed that history "exige que le créateur se transporte tout entier à l'époque choisie et y revive exclusivement," he did not put his theory into practice any more than his contemporaries did. They believed in what Littré so aptly called "l'histoire effective" as opposed to "l'histoire analytique": "L'histoire qui modifie les âmes, les opinions et les mœurs, . . . l'histoire qui jette un charme dans la légende et qui montre ce qu'il y a de grand et de touchant dans une époque délaissée et désolée, . . . l'histoire qui a l'occasion de faire intervenir dans ses narrations le charme des lieux solitaires et de la nature." It was Leconte de Lisle's privilege, as a poet, to write lyrical and symbolic history. Miss Fairlie very properly concludes: "In his vision of mankind, Leconte de Lisle's historical studies form an integral part, of value not for the absolute accuracy of the result, but for the stimulus exerted on the mind of the poet and for the many visions in which his thought and feeling found expression."

EMILE MALAKIS

The Johns Hopkins University

*The Concept of Ingratitude in Renaissance English Moral Philosophy.* By E. CATHERINE DUNN. Washington, D. C.: Catholic Univ. Press, 1946. Pp. xvi + 133.

This study succeeds (for this reviewer) in its major purpose; that is to say, a reading of it does open out new possible meanings of certain Renaissance literary works in which ingratitude might carry 'some special connotations for the Renaissance mind.' The author lays claim to a critical *raison d'être* for her study, rather than a literary-historical or a philosophical one, when she introduces her problem by way of an interpretation (Hewitt's) of *Lear*: that the moral violation which appalls us in *Lear* is the sin of ingratitude, to be distinguished from the 'filial impiety' which Sophocles portrayed in *Oedipus at Colonus*. Her suggestion that this difference represents 'a divergence between the actual attitudes of two different civilizations' carries the study into the field of intellectual history.

This alignment of purposes presses a reviewer toward the posing of certain questions concerning aims and methods of doctoral dissertations or monographs, as Dr. Dunn's study may partially typify them. This study is not 'criticism,' and I should agree with its author's implied decision that it did not need to be. One large function of such monographs is to find and present knowledge which will keep critics, who come after, from subtle misreadings of great literary works. Nevertheless, it would seem to me that answers to important critical questions should not be too lightly assumed at the outset of such studies. Dr. Dunn in fact disposed of her critical problem before she started, by answering it; one would wish rather to be made alert to that problem's existence, its precise nature, and its scope.<sup>1</sup>

The divisions within the two major ones of (I) classical and (II) mediaeval aspects of the Renaissance concept were hard to make and are intelligently made and held (save for some confusion concerning 'unreasonable' and 'unnatural,' not truly distinguishable, in I. A. 1, 2). The real value of the examination of classical and mediaeval elements in the Renaissance attitude seems to me that we should henceforth read more truly—with new semantic shadings and richer understanding of the issues—works which deal with 'unkindness' and 'concordia,' or speeches for example in Shakespeare about 'ingrates' or about 'treasonable' or 'dishonorable' ingratitude. It is the more pity, therefore, to make one's critical capital so largely consist of Hewitt's distinction between ingratitude and

<sup>1</sup> This does not quarrel with the author's decision to keep out of creative literature as finding-ground for data for her study. For this practical reasons would have sufficed, without the strange apologia offered (p. xvi). If concepts which were part of an 'artist's mimetic vision' do 'not have historical reality,' what reality indeed can concepts claim? or artists either?



filial impiety, unnecessarily worrying the reader who feels the distinction give beneath him the moment the link of 'unnaturalness' is made apparent. There is not always a sure realization of the relation between 'mediaeval' or 'Renaissance' attitudes, where Dr. Dunn can be and is of some help, and mere normal behaviour (who isn't Renaissance, if Bassanio is being so on p. 76? *cf.* also p. 87). The one real flaw structurally, one might claim, is the inclusion, in III, of a quite other concept than that examined in the rest of the study. *Gratitude to God* is simply not the concept we started out to examine, and it is obvious that we must develop sterner criteria for delimitation if English literary study is to assist in explorations of intellectual history. The pages (necessarily so limited) devoted to this different and vast subject are inevitably over-simple, and the only relevant point of contact is p. 104 (Elyot).

The only serious flaws in a useful thesis thus result from insufficient definition of just what ends were to be served by the research—and surely Dr. Dunn's book does not stand alone in that uncertainty. Other slight flaws do not invalidate the study and need not be taken seriously except as we all allow ourselves to continue to be guilty of them: too much 'this I've done, this will I do next' (39, 101), huge historical problems given their quietus in a paragraph or so (54), tags that creep in from one's 3 x 5 cards ('the cosmic aspect of ingratitude,' 53); *gaucheries* (that Dante is well known, 65, or that the xvi. c. was interested in classical literature, 98); too hazy a notion of one's possible audience (is the reader who can whip through the untranslated Latin and Italian the same reader who must have Middle English and later usages translated? e. g. *facts, departed, end, bot gif*). But of course the years have shown that Dr. Dunn's suspicions about our ignorance in the last-mentioned respect are not unfounded.

That we should need her study of classical and mediaeval commonplaces in order to read our Elizabethans intelligently bears witness to another and not unrelated fact about our ignorance as critics, over-periodized as we are. It does not behoove us to criticize over-much any book, perfect or imperfect, from which we can learn something. We should only read our own character in Dr. Dunn's treatment of 'churlish ingratitude,' and the connection with arrogance would be patent, even though we might not know enough without this author's study to see ourselves as the Persians would see us.

ROSEMOND TUVE

Connecticut College

*Sir Humphrey Mildmay: Royalist Gentleman.* By PHILIP LEE RALPH. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1947. xii + 245 pp. \$4 50.

The diary-writing impulse, weak in the sixteenth century, became stronger in the first half of the seventeenth. But few men found it easy, even in personal letters, to express on paper their inmost thoughts. Hence, though there are exceptions (Richard Rogers' diary, for example), most of the diaries that have survived tend, like those of Wilbraham and Rous, to be records rather of public events than of the personal feelings and daily lives of the diarists. Therefore the emergence from obscurity of both a diary and an account book kept by Sir Humphrey Mildmay, of Danbury, in Essex, covering the years 1633-52 is an event of some importance to students of the age of Milton. For though Mildmay's terse jottings are a far cry from Pepys, they have this in common with the greatest of diaries, that they were set down for no eye but the writer's and are more concerned with the writer himself than with the military and political events of the day.

Sir Humphrey possessed no qualities to elevate him above obscurity. He was not rich, nor learned, nor ambitious, nor virtuous, nor wicked, beyond the average of his class and time. And herein lies much of the value of his diary. For much as we might learn from an insight into the private thoughts and feelings of a Milton or a Cromwell, we could not learn from their diaries how the ordinary average man thought and felt about things.

Mildmay's diary occupies some 200 closely-written pages of a folio volume preserved among the Harleian MSS. in the British Museum. The same volume contains also 150 pages of Mildmay's personal expense accounts. No part of the volume has appeared in print, and it has not hitherto attracted wide attention, though Halliwell-Phillipps, Joseph Knight, and recently G. E. Bentley made use of the volume and referred to the diary. It is to be regretted that printing costs or the magnitude of the task prevented Dr. Ralph from giving us a complete text of at least the diary. Instead his book is a digest, illustrated—all too sparsely—with extracts.

Dr. Ralph has on the whole performed his task well. The material is selected and arranged in such a way as to produce a very readable account of Mildmay's character and way of life. It shows a man fond of eating and drinking, of gaming and, perhaps above all, talking. Yet in my opinion Dr. Ralph places too much emphasis upon the lower side of the diarist's nature. For if Mildmay loved wine and women he was no hardened roué but retained a lively sense of guilt and a desire to follow better courses. He spent a fair share of his time in church and in the company of his many clerical friends, and his favorite reading was theology. And he

records with evident pleasure many whole days spent out of doors in overseeing the workers on his home farm and appears to have taken an active interest in the welfare of his tenants. In London, where Mildmay lodged much of the time, he was a constant playgoer, and though he too often fails to write down so much as the name of the play, he tells us enough of what he saw to interest the student of the Caroline drama. Not the least interesting portion of the book is that concerned with the Royalist Mildmay's troubles during the Civil War and the early years of the Commonwealth. With a younger and unsympathetic brother influential among the Roundheads, two of his own sons in the fighting, his properties sequestered and himself entangled in legal business and treated with contumely by innumerable parliamentary committees, Sir Humphrey had but a poor time of it. "God send them shame" is a typical expression of his attitude. If he turned more and more to the tankard for solace it was not without provocation.

Dr. Ralph's few shortcomings in the performance of his part of the job appear to be the result of inexperience. While his footnotes betoken an admirable use of secondary materials, there is little evidence of any wide knowledge of contemporary works. He might have improved his book by providing annotated lists of Sir Humphrey's friends, the books he read, and the plays he saw, instead of handling these in paragraphs in which the reader soon bogs down. And considering the importance of the books and the plays to the student, the lists of them ought to be complete. Mildmay's playgoing has, it is true, been thoroughly treated by G. E. Bentley (*M. P.*, xxxv, 61-72 and *Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, II, 673-81), though Dr. Ralph gives no indication that he knew of this. The reader's confidence in Dr. Ralph's interpretation of the diarist's entries is a bit shaken by such lapses as his statement that after a christening "Mildmay reported disgustedly 'my wife a gossip'" (i. e. a godmother), and by such a sentence as "Many of the names met with in London are also encountered in Essex . . . a fact which illustrated the fondness prevalent among country gentlemen for spending part of their time in the city."

As a frontispiece Dr. Ralph provides a much-reduced facsimile of one page of the diary and in an appendix prints a transcript of the same page. The hand does not seem sufficiently difficult to justify the number of errors that may be detected even when relying upon the reduced facsimile. The handwriting cannot be held responsible for fourteen instances in which Dr. Ralph prints a perfectly normal capital "C" as a lower case (while in l. 108 of the transcript he prints it correctly). Among other errors may be noted: for *Martii* read *Martij* (l. 1); for *with* read *w<sup>th</sup>* (ll. 11, 19); for *M<sup>rs</sup>*: read *M<sup>r</sup>*: (ll. 27, 47, etc.); for *Trymed* read *Trymed* or *Trym[m]ed* (l. 39); for *Somrsett* read *Som[er]sett*. Where Mildmay writes a superior "o," as always in ordinal numbers, he is

usually careless about closing the top of the letter; to reproduce this Dr. Ralph has caused the printer to make and use an "o" with the top cut away. Mere eccentricities of handwriting such as this ought not to be reproduced in print. Equally unfortunate is the rendering of Mildmay's abbreviation for "pounds" (sterling) by a symbol formed of two parallel vertical lines crossed by a horizontal bar. Mildmay simply wrote "ll," crossed, as these letters frequently were in his day, and they ought to be printed "ll"—either with or without the cross.

GILES E. DAWSON

*Folger Shakespeare Library*

---

*Shakespeare's Imagination. A Study of the Psychology of Association and Inspiration.* By EDWARD A. ARMSTRONG. Lindsay Drummond Limited: London, 1946. Pp. vii + 191.

"This essay is an endeavor to study Shakespeare's mind in the travail of composition by investigating the associative processes revealed in his imagery and by supplementing the knowledge thus obtained by comparison and analogy with the methods of other poets and men of genius. It begins as an investigation of Shakespeare's imagination, but it becomes a study of human imagination . . ." (p. 7). Combining the techniques of Lowes on Coleridge and of Spurgeon on Shakespeare's imagery, Mr. Armstrong here studies the association of images in clusters and their strange and persistent recurrence in later plays.

Half the book is devoted to examples of bird and insect clusters. Through the connection of both with death, kites almost invariably are associated with coverlets, sheets, or beds. Jays, geese, beetles, drones: these exemplify words which, each appearing associated with certain partners in an early play, reappear in later plays. "It is not credible that the poet was fully aware of the strange frolics of his images as they changed partners like children in a game or dance, some dropping out to come in again later, or, perhaps joining up with another group. . . . I would suggest that the grouping of images into what I shall call 'image clusters' betokens the work of a subliminal organizing principle linked in some degree with emotions" (pp. 30-31).

Applied to difficult passages, this technique resolves obscurity. For example, Hamlet knows a hawk a *handsaw*, not a *hernshaw*, because of the following sequence. Falstaff's sword was "hacked like a *handsaw*"—the only other use of the word. He had earlier spoken of a "dagger of lath," "a flock of wild geese," and "a hundred upon four of us." In *Hamlet* Rosencrantz speaks of "rapiers" and "goose-quills," and a few lines later Hamlet speaks of "an

hundred ducats." Thus in *Henry IV* Shakespeare moved from the idea of the "dagger of lath" to another ridiculous weapon, a "sword hacked like a handsaw" with some added association with geese. Later, in *Hamlet*, the hundred-coin transaction and another ridiculous weapon, a goose-quill, reappear. "Thus Rosencrantz would never have mentioned goose-quills if Falstaff had not threatened to drive Prince Henry's subjects like geese!" (p. 40). And goose-quills revive the memory of Falstaff's sword "hacked like a handsaw."

The author suggests but does not pursue the interesting question of the relationship of image clusters to settings, incidents, and characterization. "The occurrence of particular images in association in a play certainly tended to generate situations and characterizations in plays written afterwards" (p. 54). But instead of applying the image technique to this related and general problem of repetition in Shakespeare, well begun in the work of Paul V. Kreider, he dismisses it as "a profitable subject for further study."

Part Two, "The Psychology of Imagination," tempts the writer gradually away from his real theme as he explores "the imaginative powers of the human mind." This effort to classify and to explain the origins of image clusters in terms of emotion, memory, sound, sense, and contiguity is disappointing. A brief appendix illustrates the application of the imagery technique to questions of authenticity. But, all in all, the writer's interest in psychology leads him to neglect the opportunity to pursue his method more thoroughly and to coordinate his work with that of other Shakespeareans. The book suggests an interesting and new approach, but a wider acquaintance with the work of other scholars would have resulted in a more useful study of Shakespeare. Mr. Armstrong's earlier book, *Bird Display*, clearly shows his mastery in the field of ornithology; *Shakespeare's Imagination* demonstrates his enviable versatility.

THOMAS P. HARRISON, JR.

University of Texas

---

*The Life of Edward FitzGerald, Translator of the Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám.* By ALFRED MCKINLEY TERHUNE. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947. Pp. xiv + 373. \$5.00.

Here is a readable and well-documented biography of the amateur orientalist who made the name of an obscure Persian poet a household word in the English speaking world, who helped Thackeray and Tennyson with encouragement and material aid at critical moments of their careers, whose friendships with them and with Carlyle justify an authoritative biography, yet whose life until this volume has been virtually unknown despite attempts at its portrayal

by A. C. Benson, J. Glyde, Thos. Wright and others. Mr. Terhune arrived at his facts by reappraising published documents and by examining more than a thousand unpublished letters, FitzGerald's commonplace and notebooks, diaries of friends and other manuscripts. He also visited scenes of the poet's life and talked with the few surviving persons who knew him. The method is scholarly, the presentation is objective, and the choice of incident is apparently uninfluenced by the fact that the biography was written with the approval of the FitzGerald family. The arrangement of the material is convenient and the intelligently selected index is unusually complete.

A portrait of a fine, sensitive man emerges from the evidence and this without recourse to biographical method which might have shown a psychological connection between the poet's mother, a handsome, imperious woman of fashion—reputedly the richest commoner in England—and her shy, kindly, and amazingly modest son, whose life of austere quietism was devoted to the highest intellectual pleasures, yet who delighted in yarning with the sailors of his native Suffolk.

Mr. Terhune's most diverting chapter unfolds the story of the anonymous first edition of the *Rubā'iyāt* translation, how it was remaindered by Quaritch at a penny, discovered by the pre-Raphaelite group, acclaimed by Charles Eliot Norton in the *North American Review*, and its translator finally identified by a Philadelphia lady, the daughter of FitzGerald's life-long friend, Fanny Kemble.

Excerpts quoted by Mr. Terhune should tempt many of his readers to excavate from its hiding places in the *Letters and Literary Remains* and the *Variorum and Definitive Edition of the Poetical and Prose Writings* another of FitzGerald's poems, the "Bird-parliament," an abridged, free translation of the *Mantiq al-Tayr* of the Persian Sūfī mystic, Farīd al-Dīn 'Attār. Were this almost unknown work to be issued in convenient form it would find an audience in agreement with Cowell who wrote to FitzGerald, "Some parts of it are truly magnificent."

We are indebted to Mr. Terhune for the definitive biography of FitzGerald. The way is now cleared for a shorter subjective study of the poet's personality and character to replace the inaccurate caricature by Benson. This portrait might show more of the *geschmacklos* Victorian background from which the poet turned to Sūfī mysticism observing, "This visionary inactivity is better than the mischievous activity of so many I see about me." The way of life of the eccentric of Woodbridge would have caused no comment in Persia. It is fitting that a rose brought from Omar's grave near Nishapur should loose its petals over his translator's tombstone at Boulge—the two poets had more in common than the *Rubā'iyāt*.

MYRON BEMENT SMITH

## BRIEF MENTION

*Das Klein-Geschichtsbuch der Hutterischen Bruder.* Herausgegeben von A. J. F. ZIEGLSCHMID. Philadelphia, Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation, 1947. Pp. xxxii, xlii, 781. Dieser neue Band der *Hutterischen Chronik* leidet nicht unter den Mängeln, die anlässlich des ersten von allen Rezensenten beanstandet wurden (vgl. *MLN*, LXI (1946), 124-128). Dabei hat er durch seine moderneren Verfasser, die entschieden im nhd. Sprachstand wurzeln, auch für den Sprachhistoriker nicht an Interesse eingebüßt. Den Hutteriten hat sich nämlich der Weg zur deutschen Einheitsprache niemals erschlossen, mit dem Eigensinn religiöser Sektierer bestanden sie vielmehr auf 'ihrer' Sprache, der in der Gestalt des Chronisten Johannes Waldner (1769-1824) übrigens ein Schriftsteller von Rang erstand. Aus der erst russischen, dann amerikanischen Umwelt sickern wohl einzelne Wortformen ein, werden aber mühelos den syntaktischen Prinzipien des Deutschen unterworfen. Dennoch bleibt die isolierte Sprache nicht etwa unverändert: Die Richtung des insularen Sprachwandels geht deutlich zum Papierdeutsch hin. Der Einfluß von deutschen Druckschriften muß ja gerade hier, wo die Korrektur durch sprachlichen Ausgleich fehlt, entscheidende Wirkungen haben. So sind in dem *Klein-Geschichtsbuch* die Grenzen zwischen alemann., bair.-österr. und ostmd. Lautstand arg verwischt, wobei dann doch auch eine Art von 'Schriftddialekt' entstanden ist, der für die hohen Wörter immer noch auf der Züricher Bibel-Sprache beruht. Alemannisch hat mithin noch den Rang einer Heiligen Sprache, während für die Dinge des Alltags deutlich ostmd. Wortschatz sich durchsetzt, wenngleich zuweilen in der Schreibung bairischer Kanzleien (mit anlautender Tenuis statt gemeindeutscher Media). So ist der Text eine schöne Illustration zu dem bekannten Kapitel über die *Sprache der Sprachinseln* und erlaubt eine Fülle fesselnder Beobachtungen.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

*A History of Hamlet Criticism.* By PAUL S. CONKLIN. New York: Kings Crown Press, 1947. Pp. viii + 176. \$2.75. This is a general survey of the attitudes of both actors and critics, English and continental, to the character of Hamlet prior to 1821. It is a most enlightening account of the development and divergence of trends, of prejudices and cerebral twists, of the effect of milieu and nationality on critical opinion. A most useful chronicle and summary. Required reading for teachers of Shakespeare on all levels.

D. C. A.

*Of Honour.* By ROBERT ASHLEY. Edited with an introduction and commentary by VIRGIL HELTZEL. San Marino, California: The Huntington Library, 1947. Pp. 80. \$2.00. This is a handsome edition of MS Ellesmere 1117 with a learned introduction which provides us with a good biography of the author and a learned commentary which tracks Ashley's blind references to their sources. The text itself adds much to our understanding of the Elizabethan gentleman and can certainly be read as a long footnote to I *Henry IV.*

D. C. A.

*Essays on Shakespeare.* By TUCKER BROOKE. New Haven: Yale Press, 1948. Pp. x + 220. \$2.75. A reprinting of seventeen essays, reviews, and addresses plus two unprinted essays on the general literature of the Renaissance but mostly on Shakespeare. Genial, learned, and diverse as was their author, they will long remain a charming monument to the most distinguished professor of English that Yale has ever had.

D. C. A.

## CORRESPONDENCE

MERCE NON MERCEDE. Dr. Allan Gilbert translates the 'merce non mercede' at the close of the December Eclogue of *The Shepheardes Calender* as, in effect, 'worldly goods perish, but not the poet's reward.' This interpretation, balancing perishing riches on the one hand, against imperishable fame on the other, is neat, perhaps clever, but is not, I believe, the intended one. 'Merce' does not, I think, mean 'goods,' here, at all. Rather, it is used, it seems to me, in the meaning in which, from the Sixth Century onward, in the Christian sense, it carried the idea of 'misericordia' or 'pity' or 'mercy.' It is the Old French 'merci' or 'merce.' As for 'mercede,' it must, of course, mean reward or fame. The crux of the matter rests in the word 'merce.' Note the very close of the Eclogue itself. Colin, alone in "secrete shade," had made "piteous mone," the "floures of his garden" having long been withered with tears. And now, having reaped only care, as his years have driven to their "latter terme" he has hung up his "pype" and bids adieu in an appeal for sympathy and affection. What, then, more appropriate than for Spenser to withhold the motto, to be used at the very end in double duty, both as Colin's own emblem and for the whole "lyttle Calender," sent with free passeports—at a lowly gate! "The Calender is to "the better please, the worse despise." In other words, Spenser wants others to like it,—at least the better ones.



As for the worse, let them be scorned, or perhaps, he would have added, let them scorn. He asks no more,—only their generosity, pity, mercy—'merce, non mercede.'

Albright College

CONSTANCE MIRIAM SYFORD

WHETSTONE AND MARLOWE. In his article on Whetstone's *English Myrror*, as a source of *Tamburlaine* (*MLN* 58, 413), T. C. Izard remarks that it has been "consistently overlooked." It is interesting to recall that it was mentioned as containing the story of *Tamburlaine* as early as 1891, by Emil Koeppel (*Englische Studien* 16, 364). But having mentioned it, he passes on with the comment *der Stoff lag in der Luft*. This early mention makes it all the more surprising that it was left for Mr. Izard to detect the importance of Whetstone as a source.

J. C. MAZWELL

Balliol College, Oxford

"SOOTH" IN SHAKESPEARE, MILTON, AND KEATS In *MLN*. (April, 1947), Charles E. Mounts' article, "'Sooth' in De la Mare, Keats, and Milton," offers an ingenious explanation for the origin of Keats' use of *soother* in *The Eve of St. Agnes* in the unusual sense of *smoother*: "With jellies soother than the creamy curd." Citing De Sélincourt's acknowledgment of H. Buxton Forman's observation that Keats was in a measure indebted for this word to Milton's "the *soothest* shepherd" (*Comus*, l. 823), i.e., Spenser he suggests that Keats in his own verse altered the Miltonic meaning of *most truthful* to *softer* or *smoother*, because his view of Spenser, unlike Milton's, was that of a mellifluous poet rather than of a moralist.

If it can be shown, however, that, in this case, Keats' chief debt was not to Milton, his opinion of Spenser would become, for the present purpose, a matter of irrelevant conjecture. That this is so, may be seen in a borrowing already indicated,<sup>1</sup> from Shakespeare's *Winter's Tale* (iv, iv, 160-161):

good sooth, she is  
The queen of curds and cream.<sup>2</sup>

Moreover, in citing De Sélincourt's reference to Buxton Forman, the author has left unmentioned the latter's significant comments that. (1) Keats must have meant *more soothing*, not *smoother*; and (2) Milton *may* have meant "'the most truth-speaking shepherd'; but it is not certain."<sup>3</sup>

Brown University

WILLIAM ELTON

<sup>1</sup> Cf. C. L. Finney, *The Evolution of Keats's Poetry* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), II, 558.

<sup>2</sup> Among Shakespeare's plays, *Winter's Tale* was one of Keats' favorites; Cf. C. F. E. Spurgeon, *Keats's Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1928), p. 5.

<sup>3</sup> *Complete Works of John Keats*, ed. H. Buxton Forman (Glasgow, 1901), II, 83 n.

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLIII

NOVEMBER, 1948

Number 7

---

## WORDSWORTH IN POLITICS. THE WESTMORLAND ELECTION OF 1818

In 1818 Henry Brougham decided to stand for one of the county seats in Westmorland. The ensuing contest, the first in Westmorland since 1774, found on Brougham's side only the Quakers, a few landowners like the Earl of Thanet and some of the Crackenthorpes, and 'the voters of the yeoman class whom the influence of Lowther castle had failed to subjugate.'<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless Wordsworth and his sister involved themselves in the campaign as if the Lowther power were seriously threatened, and indeed as if 'the majority of the populace of Westmorland [were] ready for revolution. . . .'<sup>2</sup> Wordsworth told Lonsdale that the strength of Brougham's party was in 'misguided good intention, party spirit, dissent, disaffection, envy, pride, and all the self-concerted pretensions which absurd ignorance can be incited to by headstrong reformers and revolutionists.'<sup>3</sup> And Dorothy was appalled by the low persons among Brougham's supporters: 'there was not one except Towers the Apothecary who looked in the least like a gentleman.' Brougham was dragged through Kendal by a 'set of ragamuffins' (but with her cousin William Crackenthorpe by his side), amidst a 'set of dirty lads and vagrant-like men.' She could not

<sup>1</sup> Arthur Aspinall, *Lord Brougham and the Whig Party* (Manchester, 1927), p. 87.

<sup>2</sup> *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth; the Middle Years*, ed., Ernest de Selincourt (Oxford, 1937), II, 815. D. W. to Mrs. Clarkson. The excitement of the letter may be due to her writing to Mrs. Clarkson, whose husband had just come out for Brougham; the Wordsworths seem to have regarded the Clarksons as useful for publicizing W. W.'s books among the Quakers; compare *Middle Years*, II, 622, 655.

<sup>3</sup> *Middle Years*, II, 807.

walk the streets of Kendal without 'meeting a dirty lad or lass with a blue' ribbon, servants or working girls from the local comb and hat factories, 'numbers of disgusting females shouting Brougham and independence.'<sup>4</sup> Considering in the first place Brougham's political position and the issues that he raised, and considering in the secondly place the nature of the local political machine that he was attacking, it is a little difficult to account for the excitement of Dorothy or the moral fervor of Wordsworth as he attempted in his Two Addresses to the Freeholders of Westmorland 'to give the *rationale* of the question' to the upper classes.<sup>5</sup> But a re-examination of the events surrounding the Two Addresses may, perhaps, suggest what Wordsworth was up to.<sup>6</sup>

## I

In 1818, when he contested the Lowther control of Westmorland, Brougham had already thrown over the Radicals,<sup>7</sup> and neither he nor the local Whig leaders wanted to deny that the great territorial possessions of the Lowthers permitted them to nominate one member for Westmorland.<sup>8</sup> So far as one can tell, Brougham argued

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 807-11, *passim*.

<sup>5</sup> *Middle Years*, II, 821

<sup>6</sup> After the election D. W. noted that they had lost no old friends and had gained some new ones. Viscount Lowther spent three days with them and Colonel Lowther and his wife called. And it is worth noting that W. W. became a justice of the peace in 1819. See *Ibid.*, pp. 823, 835 and note.

In 1820 W. W. used Lonsdale to help his brother on to the Mastership of Trinity College. See a letter printed in Charles Wordsworth, *Annals of My Early Life* (London, 1891), p. 8, note.

My dear Brother,—Lord Lonsdale informs me that Lord Liverpool assured him yesterday that the Mastership of Trinity would not be disposed of without consulting the Archbishop of Canterbury

Ever your affectionate Brother,

W. W.

The letter is dated 28 June 1820; it was not printed by de Selincourt. The Archbishop was Charles Manners-Sutton, for whose son C. W. had been private tutor.

<sup>7</sup> Kerth G. Feiling, *The Second Tory Party* (London, 1938), p. 292; Aspinall, *Brougham*, p. 92.

<sup>8</sup> Aspinall, *Brougham*, p. 87. At the meeting which opened Brougham's campaign, the speakers were very careful on this point; reported in the *London Times*, 17 February, 1818, from the *Carlisle Patriot*.

only one issue: would the electors of Westmorland continue the Lowthers in the 'unconstitutional' control that had turned Westmorland into a pocket borough? In 1816, it is true, he had attacked the government, but then he had been thinking, like Wordsworth, of economy, and dreaming, like Wordsworth, of a union of classes;<sup>9</sup> now, though he criticized the Lowthers' unquestioning support of Government, his chief concern seems to have been in defending himself against the charge of Jacobinism.<sup>10</sup> Of course behind Brougham was a decade of threats to order, of riots and strikes, of rick-burning and machine-breaking; but these troubles apparently did not reach Westmorland.<sup>11</sup> So far as I can see, nothing in Brougham's record or his campaign will justify either Wordsworth's excitement or the arguments he raised.<sup>12</sup>

And I cannot see that the Lowther record justified Wordsworth's campaign. Up to the middle of the eighteenth century the political power in Cumberland and Westmorland was divided among a number of families, of whom the Lowthers were by no means the greatest. In 1734, however, the Lowthers of Maud's Meaburn bought the great Wharton estates in Westmorland;<sup>13</sup> and when in 1750 Sir James Lowther, of Maud's Meaburn, inherited the estates of the Lowther and Whitehaven branches of the family, he seems to have felt able to contest the power of the Tuftons, who were the most powerful family in Westmorland. He chose to make his stand in the borough of Appleby at the election of 1754. The Tuftons won this bitter and expensive<sup>14</sup> struggle, but the Lowther candidates petitioned, and the select committee set aside the election. A formal compromise was then arranged, whereby each family re-

<sup>9</sup> Elie Halévy, *A History of the English People, 1815-1830* (London [1929]), p. 4 and note, p. 5; Feiling, *Second Tory Party*, p. 288.

<sup>10</sup> The *Times*, reprinting from local papers, gives full transcripts of his speeches on 29 January, 17 February, 31 March, and 8 April.

<sup>11</sup> *Middle Years*, II, 768, 786-7, letters from D. W. to Mrs. Clarkson on the good order in Westmorland.

<sup>12</sup> Brougham's instability and political shiftiness, of course provided W. W. with material for criticism.

<sup>13</sup> R. S. Ferguson, *Cumberland and Westmorland M.P.'s from the Restoration to the Reform Bill of 1867* (London, 1871), p. 114.

<sup>14</sup> Before the election it was estimated the £50,000 would be spent. *The Letters of Horace Walpole*, ed. Peter Cunningham (London and New York, 1857), II, 390.

tained one of the Appleby seats. And from 1754 to 1833 no election in Appleby ever went to a contest.<sup>15</sup>

During the latter half of the eighteenth century the Lowthers gained control of six of the remaining eight seats in the two counties. The two Cockermouth seats they got by default, because the Wyndhams were paying attention to their southern estates. One of the Cumberland county seats came to them after the election of 1768, when they arranged a compromise with the Portland interests; and one of the Carlisle seats became theirs by a similar compromise with the Howards after 1790. In Westmorland after 1774 they were sufficiently powerful to keep one seat for themselves and to see that either a Lowther, a Fleming, or a Muncaster had the other. Between 1774 and 1818 no county election in Westmorland ever went to a contest.<sup>16</sup>

Between 1660 and 1867 the Lowthers seated twenty-one members of the family, plus several connections by marriage. In the seventeenth century Sir John Lowther, of Lowther, sat for Cumberland for thirty-one years. A Westmorland seat was held by Sir John Lowther, of Whitehaven, from 1674 to 1700, by Colonel James Lowther from 1774 to 1812, and by Colonel H. C. Lowther for the next fifty-five years.<sup>17</sup>

There are two more or less well-known examples of the political tactics which raised the Lowthers from minor members of the gentry to this pre-eminent position in the two counties. The first is the suit with the Duke of Portland over the Forest of Inglewood. In May, 1696 William III granted the reversion of the Honour of Penrith to the then Earl of Portland. In 1705, on the death of Catherine of Braganza, who had held the land, the Earl entered into possession, not only of the Honour but also of the Forest of Inglewood and the Socage Manor of Carlisle, which he understood to have been included in the original grant. The Portland family continued in undisturbed possession until July 1767, when Sir James Lowther (the first Earl, Wordsworth's enemy) petitioned the Treasury for lease of the land for his own and two other lives, alleging that the Forest and Socage Manor were in fact Crown lands not included in the original grant.

<sup>15</sup> R. S. Ferguson, *A History of Westmorland* (London, 1894), pp. 153-4.

<sup>16</sup> Ferguson, *Cumberland and Westmorland M.P.'s*, pp. 72, 152, 212. And see his list of Members.

<sup>17</sup> Ferguson, *Cumberland and Westmorland M.P.'s*, pp. 222-3, and list of Members.

Investigation proved that the land in question had been expressly excluded from the original grant. Even so, since his family had been in possession for sixty years, Portland had a title which only the Crown could impugn,<sup>18</sup> though apparently by a prerogative that was more theoretical than actual: Junius says that Grafton revived the principle of *nullum tempus occurrit regi*.

Of course what everyone was interested in was the votes of the three hundred freeholders, all of whom were subject to the influence of the holder of the baronial right. Presumably the King and Government saw in Lowther's case an opportunity to further weaken the power of the great Revolution families. At any rate, Lowther had a good deal of cooperation from London. The Surveyor-General, for example, would not allow Portland access to the records to prove his title; and while he was still engaged in preparing his case, he was told that the Treasury felt bound to accept the Surveyor-General's recommendation that the lands be leased to Lowther.<sup>19</sup> At once the Opposition introduced a bill which would have set aside the principle of *nullum tempus*. This was rejected by a majority of twenty, and shortly afterwards Parliament was dissolved.

In Cumberland the ensuing election is said to have cost £130,000. Lowther's agents were out with bribes and with threats to the property rights of such old county families as the Senhouses and Fetherstonhaughs. One Portland supporter wrote to the Duke

The Alarm has been great, and you may be sure has been spread with all the wanton Insolence, that the Father of Lies himself, and his Infernal Agents could devise. . . . And in common discourse, every person who has any lands within, or within two miles of the Forest, are proscribed and delivered over to perdition.<sup>20</sup>

Norfolk, Portland, Carlisle, Egremont, and 'most of the gentlemen in the county' opposed Lowther, and the election was inde-

<sup>18</sup> Portland wrote Grafton protesting 'that after a possession of upwards of 60 years, any Man shall be at Liberty thro' personal Pique or Resentment, to shake the very foundations of Property, to sow Apprehensions and Disquietude in many of the first and wealthiest families of the Kingdom. . . ." A S. Turberville, *A History of Welbeck Abbey and Its Owners* (London [1939]), II, 109.

<sup>19</sup> Portland's comment to Grafton makes the political aspect quite clear: 'The jealousy that every honest & sensible man entertains of the Crown's interfering in Elections is well known' (*Ibid.*, p. 112).

<sup>20</sup> Turberville, *Welbeck Abbey*, II, 117.

ive: Curwen, the Portland candidate, was elected along with James. The latter, however, was unseated on petition. In the Portland, whom the contest had nearly ruined, was forced into compromise, under which the Lowthers controlled one of the county seats until 1831.<sup>21</sup>

In the Carlisle mushroom elections of 1786 and 1790, in which was trying to break the power of the Howards in Carlisle, Sir James used a dispute between the Corporation and the eight city wards over the qualifications for election to the freedom of the city. On 11 and 28 October, 1784 he had the Corporation repeal orders and by-laws which made membership in a guild necessary to admission to the freedom, and all which limited the rights of the Corporation to create freemen. On the 29th the Corporation created several new freemen; the next day, using lists prepared by Lonsdale's agent, they created 1195 new freemen, of whom five hundred were colliers employed by Lonsdale. In the preceding century 1520 freemen had been created; in the following six months 1443 were elected, most of them not even resident. Since the votes of the new freemen were decisive (though Parliament refused to seat the Lowther candidates after the election of 1786 and the general election of 1790), the Howards had to enter into a compromise which gave one seat to the Lowthers.<sup>22</sup>

## II

Though occurring fifty or sixty years before the Westmorland campaign of 1818, these events are not irrelevant. They not only illustrate how the Lowthers got their power, but also suggest how they kept it. In 1792 Oldfield noted that Lonsdale had purchased

<sup>21</sup> As for the question of the land, in the next session the *nullum tempus* plea was passed, with a clause saving the rights of Sir James if he exercised them within a year. He at once instituted ejectment proceedings against the tenants, but this action was nonsuited, and the lease itself was abrogated under the Civil List Act of Queen Anne. Afterwards Portland sold his rights in the land to the Duke of Devonshire.

This account is based on G. O. Trevelyan, *The Early History of Charles James Fox* (New York and London [n.d.]), pp. 355-59, the Victoria County History, *Cumberland* (Westminster, 1901-05), II, 310-11; Horace Walpole, *Memoirs of the Reign of George III*, G. F. R. Barker, ed. (London, 1941), III, 102, T. H. B. Oldfield, *The Representative History of Great Britain and Ireland* (London, 1816), III, 238.

<sup>22</sup> Ferguson, *Cumberland and Westmorland M. P.'s*, pp. 196-8.

a majority of the burgageholds, which bore the franchise in Cockermouth, and that he was careful to see that they were tenanted by 'such only as will obey his recommendation as implicitly as the fourteen hundred colliers he caused to be made in one day freemen of Carlisle.'<sup>23</sup> In 1816 he was, nevertheless, surprised that the borough was controlled by Lonsdale instead of Egremont, who was lord of the manor and could appoint the returning officer. Then he adds, 'A certain person stole the court-seal [of the manorial court-leet] some years ago, and it has since been used without his lordship's authority. . . .'<sup>24</sup> According to Oldfield, Appleby might well have been a Cornish borough, for there hog-sties were 'deemed freeholds' and purchased by the Lowthers and Tuftons 'at a price exceeding all belief'<sup>25</sup>

In 1818 the Lowthers used, or tried to use, the land assessment list to disfranchise opposing voters<sup>26</sup> For in May (the election was in June) Brougham asked the Treasury whether an order had been issued to district assessors to halt the land tax assessments<sup>27</sup> Receiving an equivocal answer, he next day read the alleged order. Lushington then denied that the Treasury had issued or sanctioned any such order, he explained that a question had risen over the title of some forty-shilling cottages. Apparently he was trying to say that the order was limited to the cottages in question. Brougham asked, and it seems a reasonable enough question, why tax officers should be concerned with examining the titles of persons who were willing to pay the taxes they were supposed to collect. At this point Lord Lowther intervened in the debate to say that he knew nothing at all about the matter, but he questioned the authenticity of the order. The chances are that it was authentic, for in a moment Sir

<sup>23</sup> T. H. B. Oldfield, *An Entire and Complete History, Political and Personal, of the Boroughs of Great Britain* (London, 1792), I, 199

<sup>24</sup> Oldfield, *Representative History*, III, 269 (This is a revised edition of the *Entire and Complete History* mentioned in the previous note)

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, v, 90 Was it, perhaps, hog-sties that Wordsworth and his brother purchased and distributed among their friends, to help save Westmorland from Brougham? See *Middle Years*, II, 805-6, 831 and John Henry Overton and Elizabeth Wordsworth, *Christopher Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln* (London, 1888), p. 28

<sup>26</sup> So had the first Earl in 1786. Edward Porritt, *The Unreformed House of Commons* (Cambridge, 1909), I, 26

<sup>27</sup> By an act of 20 George III (1770) the county franchise had been made dependent on payment of the land tax within six months of an election



## III

The tally of votes suggests that the election could never have been in doubt,<sup>30</sup> but (perhaps it was only out of habit) the Lowthers fought as if Dorothy Wordsworth's darkest fears were justified. They surrounded Brougham with troops, sailors, and special constables: from Liverpool they brought four or five stage coaches of sailors and carpenters at five shillings a day, they armed two hundred special constables, they hired miners from Alston Moor—to preserve order, they said, but Brougham thought it was to terrify his supporters. In late June Brougham told Lambton (i. e., Lord Durham) that he had a letter in which a naval officer offered £150 for four votes, the letter named Lonsdale, and Brougham hoped that he was in fact implicated.<sup>31</sup> Probably that Lowthers were as lavish in 1818 as in 1826, when they hired horses by the hundreds and many coaches to bring voters to the poll.<sup>32</sup>

The Lowthers resurrected, and showed to Wordsworth, a letter from Wilberforce to Lonsdale, enclosing without comment a letter of 1806 from Brougham in which he suggested that Lonsdale might bring him in for Westmorland if he obtained the support of Government and of the Whig landlords like Lord Thanet.<sup>33</sup> Wordsworth went to work and turned out an amusing bit of campaign verse, 'The Scottish Broom on Birdnest Brae.'<sup>34</sup>

In addition to this shrewd personal attack on Brougham, Wordsworth used the Two Addresses to raise the more general issue of Brougham's campaign as a threat to that delicate balance of classes which he was at the moment coming to consider the great ruling

<sup>30</sup> Viscount Lowther, 1211, Colonel Lowther, 1157, Brougham, 889. Ferguson, *Cumberland and Westmorland M P's*, p. 236

<sup>31</sup> *Middle Years*, II, 808, 811, 814, Aspinall, *Brougham*, pp. 90-1

<sup>32</sup> A. L. Strout, 'Wordsworth vs Brougham,' *N & Q* CLXXIV (1938), 381-3, at p. 383, quoting the *Westmorland Gazette*

<sup>33</sup> Aspinall, *Brougham*, p. 88. The letter and Lonsdale's refusal are printed in *The Manuscripts of the Earl of Lonsdale*, Historical Manuscripts Commission, Thirteenth Report, Appendix, Part VII (London, 1893), p. 184

<sup>34</sup> Note Lockhart to Scott, during the campaign of 1826. 'Dr Maginn has been taken down to Lowther Hall to assist in the Squibbery, and I think Wordsworth and he will make a pretty homogeneous work of it, for the great Laker also is enlisted—if report speak truly' *The Private Letter Books of Sir Walter Scott*, ed., Wilfred Partington (London, 1930), p. 40.

ciple of the state. The Lowther political power, he argued, 'the natural and reasonable consequence of a long-continued session of large property'; and such property defended the rights property of the middle class (he meant the smaller gentry, not industrial middle class), as well as the patriotism of the coun-

In this way it was a symbol for all the virtues of the 'mild feudalism' of England.<sup>35</sup> Here he seems to have been thinking of something like that 'spiritual medium,' in which, according to Professor Driver, Oastler felt that human activity ought to take place, and which included 'loyalties and resentments, custom and tradition, and the promise of an eternal destiny.'<sup>36</sup>

But surely at this time he was fighting a straw man. Disunity may have been; the *mystique* of feudalism perhaps was being destroyed. But this was no more than the physical sign—civil disorder—of the obsolescence of the British system of local government. The attachment of landlord, tenant, and farm laborer—which Wordsworth was really describing—had been the basis of local power of the country gentry, which the connection between the town and country had carried into the boroughs. Together the two had formed the parliamentary (that is, national) power of the landed interest. For centuries England had been governed by a governmental mechanism based on the 'social concepts of "rank and station" and "deference to one's betters" '—on the feudal theory of government by 'interests'—by the political power of the personal following of a man of family.<sup>37</sup> In 1818, no doubt, the Constitution in Church and State—the rural magistracy, tithes and impropriated land—seemed to be threatened. The unrepresented resorted to their only weapon—civil disorder. The threat hardly came from either the Whigs, no considerable number of whom had as yet aligned themselves with the industrial middle class, or from that 'most importunate of Economists,'<sup>38</sup> the unpredictable Henry Brougham. Lord Grey had already withdrawn to Northumberland, where he was defending the House of

*The Prose Works of William Wordsworth*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart (London, 1876), I, 235, 239

Cecil Driver, *Tory Radical, The Life of Richard Oastler* (New York, 1907), p. 433. Cf. *W. W. Prose Works*, I, 251-2

R. L. Hill, *Toryism and the People, 1832-1846* (London, 1929), p. 10. Introduction (by Keith Feiling), p. vi

*Prose Works*, I, 233.

Commons against the democratic spirit,<sup>39</sup> and Brougham had lately been trying to disavow an incautious statement to the electors of Westminster, made when, as Wordsworth shrewdly pointed out, ultra-radical ideas of reform seemed profitable, with a vacancy about to occur in that turbulent borough<sup>40</sup>

Besides seeking for issues like this one, Wordsworth had to defend the Lowthers against Brougham's charges of corruption and nepotism. For this he used the columns of the *Westmorland Gazette*, in general he denied what he could; where that was not possible, he tried to justify the Lowther actions. When Brougham questioned an electoral system that allowed great families to use Parliamentary seats to keep their cadets occupied, Wordsworth replied that sons of noblemen ought to be put into Parliament or public service, 'for they are exposed from their situations to peculiar temptations; and no engagements are so likely to wean them from dissipation and unprofitable pleasures, as the interests which attach to important public business.'<sup>41</sup> If Peers were not represented in Commons by persons under their influence, Wordsworth argued, their estates would be 'little better than sand liable to be blown about in the desert. . . .'<sup>42</sup> Wordsworth had to admit that Westmorland had not 'for a long time [since 1774] been disturbed by electioneering contests,' but this, he said, was the result

<sup>39</sup> See his speech of 19 September, 1817, quoted by Halévy, *English People*, p. 34

<sup>40</sup> Hansard, s 1, xxxv (1817), 360-7 (14 February), 370-4 (17 February) For W W's use of the interchange in Commons, see *Prose Works*, I, 242-3

<sup>41</sup> John Edwin Wells, 'Wordsworth and De Quincey in Westmorland Politics, 1818,' *PMLA*, LV (1940), 1087.

<sup>42</sup> *Prose Works*, I, 238 Compare R. P. Wood, writing to Lonsdale in 1806 He regarded himself 'now as entirely belonging to the Lowther party,' and 'It is with the greatest truth that I repeat that a seat in Parliament is nothing in comparison with the thought that I have enjoyed your confidence, and shared, as well as acted upon, your opinions' (Porrirt, *Unreformed Commons*, I, 336-7) Also Pitt to his mother in 1789, when Sir James Lowther offered him one of the Appleby seats 'No kind of condition was mentioned, but that if ever our lines of conduct should become opposite, I should give him an opportunity of choosing another person.' 'Appleby is the place I am to represent, and the election will be made without my having any trouble, or even visiting my constituents' (Earl Stanhope, *Life of the Right Honorable William Pitt*, London, 1879, I, 36-7).

he 'silent acquiescence and deliberate consent' of the people, did not want the unnecessary expense of a contest<sup>43</sup> he Brougham committee had asserted that Lord Lowther held cures worth two or three thousand a year, and that thus it could be said that public money was being spent in his campaign. Wordsworth answered that this accused the Lowthers of being 'parties to a scheme of unfeeling festivity, in which local insult was added to local robbery! !' Moreover Viscount Lowther held no sinecures, certainly none worth so much money. His Commissionership in India, though an honorary office, brought him no money, he received for the £1100 he received as a Treasury Lord. And as a matter of fact, the dinner in question had been paid for by the election committee—'the Country gentlemen, the Clergy, the Heads of all the Liberal Professions, leading Persons in Trade, substantial Yeomanry, in short, the chief of their Neighbours Fellow-townsmen, whom [the people] had been accustomed to respect, and whom they depended on in sickness and health for every kind of help and support'<sup>44</sup>

When Brougham attacked Government for suspending the Habeas Corpus Act, Wordsworth simply asserted that events had justified suspension, though a year before he seems to have doubted its necessity.<sup>45</sup> Apparently Brougham must have alluded to the capture of Valenciennes by the Austrians in 1793; at least Wordsworth found it necessary to defend the Government's action at the time.

He argues that they must have given 'a strong remonstrance.' Then he continues, 'But the dictates of magnanimity would have been—"this unjust act must either be abandoned, or Great Britain shall retire from a contest which, if such principles are to govern, or interfere with the conduct of it, cannot but be calamitous." A threat to this purpose was either not given or acted upon.' This is an ingeniously confused argument, and must mean that Wordsworth knew that Greville and Pitt had in 1793 offered Lille, Valenciennes, and other border cities to Austria in an effort to commit that country to the war with France and to

*Prose Works*, I, 234 At I, 223 he says that the franchise was not withheld but allowed to lie dormant

Wells, *PMLA*, LV, 1086-7

*Prose Works*, I, 230-1 On his attitude in 1817, see *Middle Years*, II, a letter of D. W. to Mrs Clarkson, 2 March, 1817 The bill to suspend was brought in on 27 February.

forestall the proposed exchange of the Electorate of Bavaria for the Austrian Netherlands <sup>46</sup>

In such arguments as these it is difficult to see Wordsworth's interest in the permanent issues of politics. Nor do his actions in the campaign suggest the disinterest with which he has been credited. He did, after all, buy freehold land and distribute it among his friends both before and after the election, as did his brother Christopher. Apparently he did not even contribute any ideas to the campaign, for Brougham was answering precisely the arguments that appear in Wordsworth's Two Addresses before the appearance of the Addresses. Wordsworth must simply have given his name and his own peculiar style to ideas already developed by the Lowther election committee

It seems clear that Wordsworth had simply been called in to defend a family political machine, an example of the political jobbery and personal control that characterized unreformed England. This he did competently enough, though even the instability of Henry Brougham hardly warranted the apparent fear, the exaggeration, and the irrelevant arguments with which Wordsworth met his campaign. I do not see why time and tenderness should alter the judgment of Peacock

Brougham is contesting Westmoreland [*sic*] against the Lowthers. Wordsworth has published an *Address to the Freeholders*, in which he says they ought not to choose so poor a man as Brougham, riches being the only guarantees of political integrity. He goes farther than this and actually asserts that the Commons ought to be chosen by the Peers. Now there is a pretty rascal for you. Southey and the whole gang are supporting the Lowthers, *per fas et nefas*, and seem inclined to hold out a yet more flagrant specimen of the degree of moral degradation to which self-sellers can fall under the domination of seat-sellers. The example will not be without its use. Of course, during the election, Wordsworth dines every day at Lord Lonsdale's <sup>47</sup>

WALLACE W. DOUGLAS

*Northwestern University*

---

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 227. On the negotiations with Austria, see J. Holland Rose, *William Pitt and the Great War* (London, 1911), p. 122.

<sup>47</sup> *The Works of Thomas Love Peacock*, ed. H. F. B. Brett-Smith and C. E. Jones (London, New York, 1934), VIII, 199.

## FONTANE AND THE GERMAN REVOLUTION OF 1848

In 1935, Mr. Arthur L. Davis published an essay on Fontane and the Revolution of 1848.<sup>1</sup> If thirteen years later the attempt is made to amend and reinterpret the material of his article, it is not done to dispute the validity of anything said heretofore. Fontane is too clear and outspoken for that. Rather, it is hoped that this complement to the existing publications will add to the picture of the poet and help in the understanding of a type of German intellectual whom we know to exist today.

In 1848, Fontane was in Berlin. He had followed the political events in Germany with keen interest for many years. As a pharmacist's apprentice he had read many of the anti-reactionary papers of Berlin.<sup>2</sup> When he moved to Leipzig in 1840, he absorbed the liberal ideas of the members of the Herwegh Club and shared the hopes for liberal reform which were entertained by everyone when Frederick William IV succeeded to the Prussian throne.<sup>3</sup> At the age of twenty-five, he served his year in the army and was introduced into the conservative group of the "Tunnel uber der Spree." He was working as a pharmacist in a rather poor section of Berlin when the Revolution broke out.

Fontane's autobiography relates with humor the happenings near the Alexanderplatz in March 1848; how he, in his enthusiasm, joined a mob in the attack on a theater and how a bystander restored his sense of perspective with a laconic "Na, horen Sie . . ." and ended the "Winkelriedun."<sup>4</sup> It also tells about his election as *Wahlmann* but ignores Fontane's literary and epistolary occupation with the events of the day.<sup>5</sup> For his interest in the Revolution remained unabated in spite of his disgust for a cowardly and undisciplined mob on the one hand and inefficient assemblies on the other. In the summer of 1848, he published four articles in the

<sup>1</sup> Arthur L. Davis, "Fontane and the Revolution of 1848," *MLN* (January 1935), pp 1-9

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid*, p. 2

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Von Zwanzig bis Dreissig*, 2, II, 17. This and subsequent references to Fontane's works are to series, volume, and page of the *Gesammelte Werke Jubiläumsausgabe*, Berlin, 1920

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, 2, II, 391 f

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*, 413-417

*Berliner Zeitungshalle*<sup>6</sup> which show him in full accord with the aims of the Revolution—unity and freedom. Prussia, he felt, was too weak to bring about German unity; therefore it had to give way to forces which could achieve this goal. As for freedom, his "politisches Glaubensbekenntnis von 1848" agreed with the words "... die er in jener Arbeit über Marwitz aus dessen Munde anführt und nachdrucklich unterstreicht. 'Die Freiheit ist das allein Wertvolle, und alles Wissen kann in einem Sklavenlande nicht gedeihen, nicht echte Frucht treiben.'"<sup>7</sup> Alexander von der Marwitz was anything but a liberal so that this concurrence of opinions would be "merkwürdig"<sup>8</sup> indeed, if it were not obvious that Fontane and the populace were thinking of different things when they used the slogans of the Revolution.

When in 1930 Julius Petersen published seven letters of Fontane to Bernhard von Lepel, he made a most valuable contribution to the literature of the Revolution year proper. If *Von Zwanzig bis Dreissig* deals largely with the beginning of the revolt, these letters deal with its end; whereas the former is the work of a reminiscing old gentleman, the latter are free of the "Ironie, mit der der Rückblick des Alten seine Revolutionserinnerung farbte."<sup>9</sup>

In September 1848, Fontane was in Bethanien, a Protestant hospital in one of the nicest sections of Berlin. Here he learned about actions and orders of counterrevolutionary ministers and generals, and once more his indignation was aroused. From the quiet Mariannenplatz he wrote to a Prussian nobleman to lend him a rifle, since the moment "erheischt Thaten, oder doch Wort und That."<sup>10</sup> The request received another "na, hören Sie . . ." although the sobering effect of Lepel's answer was not immediately apparent. "Freund, verdirb mir nicht unnutz die Freude, die ich an Dir habe," wrote von Lepel, "lege die Untugenden, die mich nach gerade an Dir argern, ab u. scheitere bei Deinem Republi-

<sup>6</sup> Quoted by Heinrich Spiero, *Fontane*, Wittenberg, 1928, pp. 39 f.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 40.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Julius Petersen, *Fontane im Revolutionsjahr 1848*, Berlin, W. Buchsenstein, 1930, p. 3. Reference is to this edition, although these letters are now also to be found in *Theodor Fontane und Bernhard von Lepel Ein Freundschaftsbriefwechsel*, hrsg. von J. Petersen, München, C. H. Beck, 1940, 2 Bände.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

kanismus nicht an der Klippe den *gentleman* dran geben zu müssen."<sup>11</sup> Fontane replied immediately and admitted the absurdity of his request. But the injustices committed made him retract only his bitterness and not his point of view. And as to the gentleman, "Was soll ich dazu sagen . . . ?"<sup>12</sup> Lepel knew Fontane better than Fontane himself. In his next letter he repeated his Leitmotiv: "Das schlimmste Wort, das Du aussprichst, ist das, dass Du Dir nichts daraus machst, in Gefahr zu stehn, nicht mehr gentleman like zu bleiben."<sup>13</sup>

Fontane's defense was a factual account of Prussian history. Giving the Prussian princes much credit for the growth of Prussia, he felt that the common people had been responsible for the liberation from the Napoleonic yoke and that they were being cheated out of their gains. Their demands seemed more than modest. They wanted freedom, and "ein gutes und gesittetes Volk ist immer reif für die Freiheit."<sup>14</sup> And they wanted it not as charity.

Sie [die Könige] können sich darin nicht schicken dem Volke sein Darlehn zurückgeben, sie wollen nichts horen vom "souveränen Volke" das zu fordern hat, sie wollen immer noch schenken—aus Gnade, und nach Gefallen. Das Volk kann aber keine Gnade gebrauchen, es will nicht mal "vereinbaren", sondern es spricht ganz deutlich "das will ich" und was noch übrig bleibt, das kannst Du behalten." Der achte Constitutionalismus ist weiter nichts als ein Compliment vor dem sogenannten "historischen Recht,"—ist nichts andres als eine Pensionierung der Kinder für die Dienste, die die Vater geleistet haben, ein *gentlemanlike's* Benehmen des sonst etwas groben und rücksichtslosen Volkes.<sup>15</sup>

It is evident that the "gentleman" stuck in Fontane's mind, and also that he could be an advocate of republicanism only as long as he believed in the inner nobility of the common people. Did he still believe in it in November 1848? The last long letter to Lepel reiterates once more the history of the year, but the rights of the people play a smaller part than the wrongs committed by the King.<sup>16</sup>

By 1849, Fontane realized that he had labored under certain misconceptions. The people had not organized their demands nor their forces. They were not really "ein gutes und gesittetes Volk." And if Prussia was weak and ruled by *Willkur*, it was still the

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 21-29.



strongest power available. "Ware es denkbar, dass sich aus Lippe-Schaumburg oder aus Hohenzollern-Hechingen ein grosses, einiges Deutschland bilden konnte und wolle, so wurd' ich preussische Regierung und preussisches Volk verachten;" he wrote to Wolfsohn.<sup>17</sup> As it was not thinkable, he tried to improve the existing Prussia in the name of a vanished one. The state of Frederick II had by no means been ideal, but it had been a "Rechtsstaat." In advocating a "militarisch organisierten Rechtsstaat" in place of the "Schreckensregiment polizeilicher Willkur"<sup>18</sup> he felt he was helping the cause of democracy. This may seem as extreme moderation and in contrast with previous statements, but one must not forget that Fontane's concept of Eighteenth-Century Prussia was different from ours. A letter from 1888 contains the rhetorical question "was kann preussischer sein, als Minna v. Barnhelm und Nathan?"<sup>19</sup> And certainly, his plea based on a glorious historical tradition appealed to more people than the arguments of "3 Polen, 2 Juden und einem Zuchthausler."<sup>20</sup>

The vicissitudes of his personal life during the fifties made for an occasional outburst against Prussia, but in objective moments, Fontane's thinking showed consistency. In Brussels in 1852, he was reminded of the time when good citizens were able to run their own affairs, but since then, "der Gotze der Bequemlichkeit hat den Gott der Freiheit in den Staub getreten."<sup>21</sup> And the same Fontane who in 1852 hoped to have the King as godfather for a seventh son "auf gut preussisch"<sup>22</sup> expressed the wish in 1856 that his next child be born on November 4. "Das ist der langerwartete Tag, wo in Nordamerika die Präsidentschaftswahl stattfindet."<sup>23</sup> The United States and medieval Holland and Belgium showed the kind of dignity which justifies revolutions. As a man in his seventies he referred again to the "Betrachtung eines beständig fortschreitenden

<sup>17</sup> *Theodor Fontanes Briefwechsel mit Wilhelm Wolfsohn*, hrsg. von Wilhelm Wolters, Berlin, 1910, p. 46

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 47-52. A German officer gave the same "Rechtsstaat" idea as the reason for the Stauffenberg *Attentat* on Hitler.

<sup>19</sup> Letter to Leo Berg, July 8, 1888, facsimile 1928.

<sup>20</sup> Petersen, *op cit.*, p. 31.

<sup>21</sup> Theodor Fontane, *Briefe an seine Familie*, hrsg. von K. E. O. Fritsch, Berlin, F. Fontane & Co., IV Aufl.; 1905, p. 9

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 77.

Amerikanismus, eines eigentümlich freiheitlichen Entwicklungsganges, den zu verfolgen seit Jahr und Tag meine Passion ist."<sup>24</sup> In 1857 he was on the side of the Sepoys: "Mein Herz jubelt stets, wenn ein getretenes Volk, Christ oder Heide, seine Bedrucker niederwirft."<sup>25</sup>

Between 1858 and 1860, Fontane had occasion to review the events of 1848, this time from the angle of the conservative forces. *Die Grafschaft Ruppin*, the first volume of the *Wanderungen durch die Mark Brandenburg*, appeared in 1860 and contains the history of the Regiment Mecklenburg-Schwerin which had a part in the quelling of the rebellion.

"Es war eben nicht alles so, wie es sein sollte;" Fontane begins his sketch of the background.<sup>26</sup> The promises of 1815 had not been kept, and that was why freedom was born. "Aber sie konnte ihren unmittelbaren Ursprung nicht verleugnen, und mit jedem Tage wurde es klarer, dass sie von der Gasse stammte."<sup>27</sup> The poet is speaking of Berlin, and in particular of the *Zeughaussturm*:

Ein lehrreiches Kapitel in der Geschichte der Revolutionen, zugleich ein treffliches Beispiel dafür, dass Unternehmungen von einer nicht wegzudisputierenden historischen Bedeutung oft nicht bloss durch die zweifelhaftesten, sondern auch geradezu kummerlichsten Mittel in Szene gesetzt werden. Hundert oder zweihundert verwegene Bursche, Bursche, die was auch kommen moge, nur zu gewinnen haben, rottieren sich zusammen, und in weniger als einer halben Stunde sind aus den zweihundert zwanzigtausend geworden.<sup>28</sup>

However, the number means little. Everybody wants to watch, and nobody wants to take the initiative. "Wer das im Auge hat, wird solcher Bewegungen in der Regel leicht Herr werden."<sup>29</sup>

How different, how sympathetic is the description of the street fights in Dresden! And this is the reason:

Es handelte sich also nicht um 'Gesindel,' das bekämpft werden sollte, sondern, wie schon hervorgehoben, um eine Elite-Truppe, die nach Intellekt,

<sup>24</sup> Cf. A. L. Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

<sup>25</sup> Theodor Fontane, *Briefe Zweite Sammlung*, hrsg von O. Pniower und P. Schlenther, third ed. 1910, vol. 1, p. 183.

<sup>26</sup> Theodor Fontane, *Wanderungen durch die Mark Brandenburg*, Erster Teil, Wohlfeile Ausgabe, 14. und 15. Aufl., Stuttgart und Berlin, Cotta, 1912, p. 244.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 245.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 246.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

Wissen und bürgerlicher Stellung erheblich hoher stand, als die uckermärkischen Fusiliere, die hier unsererseits in den Kampf eintraten. Je bestimmter ich auf Seiten dieser letzteren stehe, desto freier darf ich es auch aussprechen, dass nichts falscher und ungerechter ist, als auf die Scharen des Mai-Aufstandes verächtlich herabzublicken. Die Schuld lag bei den Führern. Und auch hier ist noch zu sichten. Neben Ehrgeizigen und Boswilligen standen aufrichtig begeisterte Leute. Eine Republik herstellen wollen, ist nicht notwendig eine Dummheit, am wenigsten eine Gemeinheit.<sup>30</sup>

Everything Fontane said about revolutions after 1860 sounds like a summary of earlier statements. There is really no paradox between the ideas expressed in *Fester Befehl*, the famous poem written around 1889<sup>31</sup> and the remarks in his autobiography and letters of four years later. For the same Fontane who distrusted unsuccessful revolutions<sup>32</sup> wrote to Bernhard Caspar: "Revolutionen gehen zum grossen Teile von Gesindel, *Va banque*-Spielern oder Ver-rückten aus, und was waren wir ohne Revolutionen. Das sage ich, der ich eigentlich ein Philister bin."<sup>33</sup> Not until the year of his death, 1898, does 1848 become "langweilig" to the old gentleman.<sup>34</sup>

Did Fontane change his mind on the Revolution of 1848? At one time, he had believed Prussia incapable of unifying Germany. He revised that opinion. His concept of freedom had always been different from that of those who wanted to change the face of the world. The artist in him may at all times have been aware of the fact that some forms of socialism actually lead as far away from freedom as autocracy. In the autobiographical notes of the painter Wilhelm Gentz he found this expressed very clearly. "Die persönliche Freiheit ist mir in der Politik das Ideal. Daher bekenne ich mich nicht zur Sozialdemokratie, die ein Untergraben derselben bedeutet."<sup>35</sup> As a historian he wanted any change to be linked with a tradition and for that purpose idealized Old Prussia. As a Berliner, he shared many of the characteristics of all Berliners. A passage from Ricarda Huch's *Alte und neue Gotter* may illustrate what is meant by this.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 247.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Davis, *op. cit.*, where the poem is given as the conclusion.

<sup>32</sup> *Meine Kindertage*, 2, 1, 195.

<sup>33</sup> Theodor Fontane, *Briefe Zweite Sammlung*, hrsg. von O. Pniower und P. Schlenther, second ed. 1910, vol. 2, p. 311.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 461.

<sup>35</sup> *Wanderungen*, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

Die Geistesverfassung und Eigenart der Berliner gaben dieser Revolution den wunderlichen, aus Schrecken und Komik gemischten Charakter. Barrikaden schossen auf, Kanonen brüllten, Flammen schlugen gegen den mond hellen Himmel, Blut floss und Sterbende sturzten auf das aufgerissene Pflaster, aber die Gutgelauntheit und der unerschütterliche Witz des Volkes, die dickbauchige Wichtigtuerei der Honoratioren, die handfeste Gelassenheit der Arbeiter, der gesunde Menschenverstand aller, liessen ein rechtes Pathos nicht aufkommen. Die Deputationen aus der Bürgerschaft, die zum König marschierten, der Austausch zutraulicher und landesvaterlicher Sätze, zwischen denen nur hin und wieder ein böser Blick oder ein beissendes Lächeln aufzuckte, die Versammlungen unter den Zelten und die Reden grossmauliger Demokraten, pöfzig glossiert von feiernden Arbeitern und seelenvegnugten Bummlern, das alles hatte mehr von einem Schutzens-feste als von einer Revolution.<sup>36</sup>

Mr. Davis in his conclusion stressed the fact that Fontane had been carried away by the wave of enthusiasm which swept all over Germany in 1848. Yet, while it was not in the poet's nature to identify himself with the rabble, the letters to von Lepel show that his enthusiasm was not quite so "fleeting"<sup>37</sup> as one might believe after reading *Von Zwanzig bis Dreissig*. And correct as it may be to say that Fontane realized "the mistakes in method and deficiencies in organization of the movement which attempted to establish prematurely a new political order,"<sup>38</sup> this summary does justice to the historian and political realist only. As was illustrated, however, Fontane was also an artist and a Berliner. But above all he was—Lepel understood this, and the account of the struggle in Dresden proves it—a gentleman who knew that character can create as strange bedfellows as politics:

Man kann heute noch, innerhalb der politischen Welt, vielfach dasselbe beobachten. Konservative wie Liberale, die zufällig in ihrem zunächst gelegenen Kreise nur groblich gearteten Elementen ihrer eigenen Partei begegnen, ziehen es vor, in Leben und Gesellschaft mit ihren Gegnern zu verkehren, sobald sie wahrnehmen, dass diese Gegner ihnen in Form und Sitte naher verwandt sind. Die Verschiedenartigkeit der Ansichten kann zwischen feineren Naturen unter Umständen zu einem Bindemittel werden, aber grob und fein schliessen einander aus.<sup>39</sup>

Speaking about his *Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen*, Thomas Mann once said: "Ich habe meine Ansichten geandert, aber nicht

<sup>36</sup> Ricarda Huch, *Alte und neue Gotter*, Berlin and Zurich, 1930, p. 338.

<sup>37</sup> A. L. Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>39</sup> *Wanderungen*, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

meine Gesinnung."<sup>40</sup> It seems that Richard Dehmel showed an almost uncanny intuition when he called the author of *Königliche Hoheit* the heir of Theodore Fontane.<sup>41</sup>

ROLF LINN

*Santa Barbara College*

#### FOUR UNPUBLISHED CHAUCER MANUSCRIPTS

Although the existence of the first three of the four texts published here has been known for some time, no one has seen fit to print or study them. Even so, they have a fair amount of textual interest, and their inaccessibility has led at least one scholar astray.<sup>1</sup> The fourth text, a copy of the last stanza and the envoy of the *Purse* in MS 176, Caius College, Cambridge, was overlooked by Professor MacCracken when he printed the other two stanzas from that manuscript in 1912.<sup>2</sup>

In transcribing these texts,<sup>3</sup> I have ignored all flourishes that seem plainly meaningless, and have expanded the abbreviations, indicating the expansion by italics. The abbreviations are all normal. To each of the texts I have prefixed a statement of its affiliation, but the statement is necessarily very short because of the complexity of the material.

<sup>40</sup> Private Conversation, January 1946.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid* Quoted by Th. Mann from a Lost Letter

<sup>1</sup> See below, fn. 9.

<sup>2</sup> *MLN*, xxvii (1912), 228-29. The first two stanzas appear on p. 23 of the MS. Professor MacCracken was presumably unaware that the last stanza and the envoy occur earlier. In 1940 Dr. J. W. Alexander and I, noting the statement "[under p. 12] Last stanza and envoi of ballad on purse, p. 23" in M. R. James's description of the MS (*A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Gonville and Caius College*, [Cambridge, 1907], I, 201), requested a photograph of p. 12 but because of the war were unable to obtain it. The occurrence of the last stanza and the envoy in Caius College 176 has since been noted in the Brown-Robbins *Index of Middle English Verse*.

<sup>3</sup> The transcriptions are from photographs. I am grateful to the authorities of the British Museum and to the Librarians of Caius and Gonville College, Cambridge, Magdalene College, Cambridge, and Trinity College, Dublin, for permission to print the transcriptions. I am also indebted to Professor Robert Caldwell for transcribing for me, some years ago, the copy of *Truth* in the University of Chicago's photostat of Pepys 2006 (The transcription printed here, however, is my own).

<sup>4</sup> The statements are from unpublished studies of the texts of *Truth*, the

I. *Truth* MS. Additional 36983, British Museum, f 262<sup>a</sup>.<sup>5</sup> Fifteenth Century.<sup>6</sup> Classification. Represents more closely than any other extant MS. the parent of the large group of authorities comprised of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 203; Fairfax 16 (2 copies), Bodleian, Harley 7333, British Museum, Hatton 73, Bodleian, Lambeth Palace Library 344; Trinity College, Cambridge, R. 3. 20 (2 copies); Arch. Selden B 24, Bodleian, and the prints of Caxton and Thynne.<sup>7</sup>

- Fle ffrom the pres and dwell with sotheffastnesse  
 Suffise vnto thy Goode though it be smalle  
 ffor horde hathe hate and clymyng tykilnes  
 Pres hathe envye and wele is blent ouer all  
 [5] Sauoure nomore thenne the behove schall  
 Do wele thy selffe that other folke canst rede  
 And trouthe the schall deluere it is no drede  
 Peyne the nat all crokid to redresse  
 In trust of hur that turneth as a halle  
 [10] Grete rest stant in litle besynesse  
 Beware also to spurne a yenst an all  
 Stryue nat as dothe the crok with the wall  
 Daunt thy selffe þat dauntest others dede  
 And trouthe the schall deluere it is no drede  
 [15] That the is sent resceyve in buxumnesse  
 The wrastelyng of this worlde axeth a falle  
 Here is none home here is butt wildirnes  
 fforthe pilgrymme forthe, fforthe best oute of thy stalle  
 Loke vp on high and thank thy god of all  
 [20] Wayse thy lust and lete thy gost the lede  
 And trouthe the schall deluere it is no drede

Lenvoy

#### Notes

- 4 blent] apparently written first as *brent* and corrected to *blent*. The reverse process, however, may have occurred.  
 18. ;] MS has an inverted semicolon.

*Purse* (now in press in the *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia*, Volume 1), and *Lak of Stedfastnesse*

<sup>5</sup> This MS was formerly the Bedford MS. It is described by Furnivall, "The Chaucer and the 'Cursor Mundi' MS. in the Bedford Library, Bedford," *Athenaeum*, Nov 11, 1876, pp 623-24.

<sup>6</sup> The date 1442 appear on f 216<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Professor Robinson's statement (*Chaucer*, p 1037), "A<sup>s</sup> [Additional 36983] resembles F [the two copies in Fairfax]," implying near kinship, may be disregarded as too general. A<sup>s</sup> and the two copies in F simply belong to the same group of MSS; thus, in the same fashion that it resembles F, A<sup>s</sup> resembles any of the authorities listed above.

- 20 Wayse] error for *Weyve* (Fairfax<sup>1</sup> quoted). This is the MS.'s only unique reading
22. Lenvoy] MS lacks the envoy as well as the title. The scribe has written *Lenvoy* at the end of several poems, perhaps mistaking the word to mean something like "the end." There is thus no reason to think that the parent contained the envoy.

II. *Truth*. MS. Pepys 2006. Magdalene College, Cambridge, pp. 389-90.<sup>8</sup> Late Fifteenth Century. Classification. Stands textually immediately above Lansdowne 699, British Museum, de Worde's and Pynson's prints; and Arch. Selden B. 10, Bodleian, and immediately below Cambridge University Library Kk. 1. 5 in the group composed of those authorities.<sup>9</sup>

Le bon counsell—de Chaucer

Fle fro the pres and dwelle with sothfastnesse  
 Suffise vnto thi gode bough it be small  
 ffor hoide hath hate and clymyngge tikilnesse  
 Pres hath enuye and wele is blent ouer all  
 [5] Sauoure no more than bi houe shall  
 Rule thi self þat oþer folk kanst rede  
 And trouth the shall delyuer it is no drede

<sup>8</sup> The MS has been described frequently, see, for example, Manly and Rickert, *The Text of the Canterbury Tales*, I, 406

<sup>9</sup> Brusendorff's remarks on the Pepys 2006 text of *Truth* should be corrected. In discussing the Caxton booklet, *The Temple of bras*, he develops the following theory (*The Chaucer Tradition*, pp. 196-97) "All these items . . . are paralleled in Pepys I-II [Pepys II is Pepys 2006] in closely agreeing texts and accordingly we may safely assume the existence of a set of MS booklets as the sources of Pepys-Caxton. This set must have comprised the following Chaucerian MSS." Among these MSS he lists, as No. 6, "A final booklet, containing half a dozen short poems by Chaucer with French titles, found chiefly in Pepys (II), but also partly in Caxton . . . and in Fairfax." Among these items (*d* and *c* respectively) are *Truth* ("*Le bon counsell—de Chaucer* [PII, C III (Caxton), F I-II (the two copies in Fairfax)]") and the *Purse* ("*La compleint de Chaucer a sa Bourse Voide* [P II, C II (*The compleint of Aneida*), F II]" )

The Pepys 2006 text of *Truth*, however, cannot have had the same source as Caxton's print. not only do the two texts belong to separate MS groups, but neither stands at the head of its group (Caxton's print, indeed, is low). The texts of the *Purse* in Caxton and in Fairfax cannot have had an exclusive common ancestor (cf., for example, the classification by Holt in the *Globe Chaucer* of 1898 [p. 11] and the arrangement by Robinson [*Chaucer*, p. 1039])

In view of the above-stated objections, Brusendorff's theory of the origin of "Pepys-Caxton" can hardly be considered tenable. When he comes to discuss the *Truth* texts in detail, he omits Pepys 2006 but writes this surprising footnote: "Of the text in Pepys I have unfortunately no notes" (p. 245, fn. 2).

- Peyn the not ech croked to redresse  
 In trust of here þat turneth as a ball  
 [10] Grete reste stant in lytell besynesse  
 Be ware also to spern ageyn a all  
 Stryue not as doth a crokke with a wall  
 Daunte [þ1 self] þat dauntest oþer dede  
 And trouthe the shall delyuer it is no drede  
 [p. 390]
- [15] That the is sente receyue in boxomnesse  
 The wrastelinge of this wolld axeth a fall  
 Here nys non hom here nysbut wildernesse  
 fforth pilgrym forth beste out of thī stall  
 Loke vp an hy and thanke god of all
- [20] Weyue thin luste and lat thī goste the lede  
 And trouth the shall delyuer it is no drede

## Notes

5. than h1 houel MS omits *the* (Cambridge University Library KK 1. 5 quoted), writes *than* with a superscript *a* over *n*. Perhaps the parent read *than thu* (as in Philipps 8299). Since minuscule *n* and *u* are indistinguishable in Pepys 2006, the only difference between *than* and *thu* is the superscript *a* over the *n*.
13. þ1 self] written in the margin in what looks like the same hand, with the position in the line indicated by a caret.
16. wolrd] so MS

III. *Lak of Stedfastnesse*. MS. 432, Trinity College, Dublin, f. 59<sup>a</sup>.<sup>10</sup> Middle Fifteenth Century. Classification: Uncertain. This copy omits the first stanza and reads the remainder in reverse order, beginning with the envoy. The text, which is generally bad, seems clearly to have been written from memory; the scribe may well have been familiar with more than one version of the poem. Although the classification of this text is uncertain, it appears to belong with the group Harley 7333, Hatton 73, Lambeth Palace Library 344, and Trinity College, Cambridge, R. 3. 20, with possible contamination—presumably memorial—with Trinity College, Cambridge, R. 14. 51. ~

## [Envoy]

- \*\*\*\*\*es that desyre to be honorable  
 \*\*erisshe ye your folk hate extorcoun  
 Suffer no thing þat may be repreuable  
 To your astate wher ye haue correctioun  
 [5] Shawe forthe your yerde of castigacion  
 Drede god do lawe love trowthe & worpines  
 & knyht to gydre your peple with stedfastnes  
 [Stanza 3]

<sup>10</sup> The MS. is described by T. K. Abbott, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin* (Dublin, 1900), p. 67.



- Trouþe is rebuked & reson is hold but fable  
 So vertu hathe now no dominatioun  
 [10] Pety is exciled no man is merciable  
 Thorow couetise is blent discretioun  
 Þe world hathe made a permutacioun  
 ffrom right to wrong from trouþe to fikelnes  
 Þat all is lost for lak of stedfastnes  
 [Stanza 2]  
 [15] What causeþ this world to be so variable  
 But lust þat folk haue in discencion  
 ffor now on dayes a man is holde onable  
 But he can com be sum ymaginacioun  
 To do his neyghbor wrong . or oppressioun  
 [20] What causeþ this but sotel dowblenes  
 Þat all is lost for lak of stedfastnes

## Notes

- 1 \*\*\*\*\*] illegible, perhaps MS read *Princes*  
 2 \*\*erisshe] illegible, but undoubtedly *Cherisshe*

IV. *The Complaint of Chaucer to His Purse* (last stanza and envoy). MS. 176, Caius College, Cambridge, p 12<sup>11</sup> Late Fifteenth Century Classification. Immediately below Additional 22139, British Museum, and immediately above Caxton's print and Pepys 2006 in the group composed of those authorities<sup>12</sup>

- [15] Now purse that be to me my lyvys Light  
 And saueour as in this worde downe here  
 Of hch this tounne helpe me throuþe your myȝt  
 Sith that ye wilnot be my tresour  
 For I am shae as nyghe as any frere  
 [20] But yet I pray vnto you curteously  
 Be hevy agayne or els most I dye  
 [In margin the word lenvoye]  
 O conquerour of Brutus Albion  
 Which that by lyne & fre elecion  
 Be verrey kyng this to you I sende

<sup>11</sup> See fn 2 above

<sup>12</sup> The copy on p 12 (CC<sup>1</sup>) is in a hand similar to that of the copy on p 23 (CC<sup>2</sup>) but not the same. The two texts are also of different provenance. In this connection one should note that Dr C F Buhler, in his classification of the *Purse* MSS (*MLN*, LII [1937], 7), considers CC<sup>2</sup> a sister of Pepys 2006 and Additional 22139 on the basis of their common omission of *yf* in l. 4. He omits Caxton's print, when that text and all the variant readings are considered, his argument is not convincing. I place CC<sup>2</sup> more as in Robinson (*Chaucer*, p 1039).

- [25] And you that may all my mys amend  
Haue mynde opon my supplicacon

## Notes

- 16 worde] error for worlde (Additional 22139 quoted). This error as well as the error *tresour* (for *tresorere*) in l 18 is shared by the Stow edition of 1561. Since the Stow text is a copy of the undated (1545?) Thynne edition, which reads *tresoure* but correctly *worlde*, the agreement with CC<sup>1</sup> seems nonsignificant.
- 17 Of lich] although apparently meaningless, clearly the reading of the MS.
- 19 Shae] error for *shaue* (Add 22139 quoted).
- 25 all my mys] the variants here are as follows: *alle harmes* (Caxton, Pepys 2006), *alle meyn harme* (Fairfax 16), *all oure harmes* (Harley 7333, Cambridge University Library Ff 1 6); the remaining MSS lack the envoy. CC<sup>1</sup>'s reading perhaps derives from a spelling *all har mys*, in the non-book hands of the period, *har* and *my* do not look unlike.

With the printing of these texts, there remain unpublished only four manuscripts of Chaucer's Short Poems. One of these is now the subject of study;<sup>13</sup> the most significant readings of the second and third can be found in Robinson's notes;<sup>14</sup> but the fourth, a casualty of the war, seems lost for some time if not for ever.<sup>15</sup> Of the nature of its text nothing is known.

GEORGE BLOCKER PACE

University of Virginia

<sup>13</sup> The Cambridge University Library Gg 4 27 (b) MS of *Gentillesse*

<sup>14</sup> The Leyden University Library Vossius 9 MS of *Truth* and *Fortune*. These two texts were transcribed by Professor Robinson, but the transcription has been lost (letter from Professor Robinson dated Sept. 26, 1940). I have long had a standing order for photostats of these texts.

<sup>15</sup> The Phillips 11409, Cheltenham, MS of *Truth*. The existence of this copy of *Truth* is somewhat doubtful. Brown (*Register of Middle English Religious Verse*, No 515) lists the MS. for *Truth* with a question mark. The Brown-Robbins *Index* simply repeats the entry of the *Register*. Furnivall (*Parallel Text Edition of Chaucer's Minor Poems*, p. 407) writes thus. "Besides the above [various copies of *Truth*], there are late paper copies in the Bedford Library MS. [the Additional 36983 printed here], and the Phillips (Cheltenham) 11409." There seems no particular reason to doubt this statement. Perhaps the circumstances that prevented the publication of Additional 36983, whatever they may have been, also prevented the publication of Phillips 11409.

In response to a request made for me by Mr. Francis Berkeley of the Alderman Library, Mrs. Alan Fenwick of Cheltenham states (Dec. 12, 1946) that the library, now the property of her husband, was partly stowed away during the war, and that for the time being, at least, nothing can be told about MS. Phillips 11409.

## GUY DE MAUPASSANT AND LOUIS LE POITTEVIN

Maupassant's violent opposition to the publication of anything relating to his personal affairs is well known. Perhaps the most effective expression of his sentiments on that score is contained in the letter written to an unidentified correspondent in which he stated:

J'ajoute que je me suis toujours refusé à fournir des renseignements sur moi pour être publiés. Tout ce que j'écris appartient au public, aux critiques, à la discussion et à la curiosité, mais je désire que tout ce qui touche ma vie et ma personne ne donne lieu à aucune divulgation. . . <sup>1</sup>

This policy, stubbornly adhered to by Maupassant particularly during the last few years of his life, was jealously continued for ten years following the writer's death by his mother,<sup>2</sup> Mme Laure de Maupassant, who destroyed many documents which might have helped us to understand somewhat better the complex personality of her famous son. Some of Maupassant's friends, too, faithful to his intransigent views on the matter, refused to allow for publication letters they had received from the author of *Boule de Suif*. Dr. Henri Cazalis, his friend and physician, answered in part as follows Lombroso's request for material on Maupassant:

Quant à ses lettres, il m'avait exprimé toujours le désir qu'elles ne fussent jamais publiées; celles que j'ai eues de lui, je les ai détruites en partie pour me conformer à sa volonté.<sup>3</sup>

The result is that nearly fifty years after the death of Maupassant much of his life and literary career still remains unknown or obscure. Existing biographies, for example, only casually mention the name of Louis Le Poittevin in connection with Maupassant.<sup>4</sup> Yet Le Poittevin was one of Guy's closest friends, and while he did not exert on Maupassant the sort of influence exerted by his father,

<sup>1</sup> *Chroniques, études, correspondance de Guy de Maupassant*, Paris, Librairie Grund, 1938, p. 372.

<sup>2</sup> Until her own death in 1903.

<sup>3</sup> Lombroso, Albert, *Souvenirs sur Maupassant*, Rome, Bocca Frères, 1905, p. 586. Forty-four letters by Maupassant to Dr. Cazalis (the poet Jean Lahor) were sold at the Suzannet sale in 1938 (lot 164).

<sup>4</sup> Cf., among others, René Dumesnil's outstanding work, *Guy de Maupassant*, Paris, Tallandier, 1947.

Alfred Le Poittevin, on Flaubert, their relationship deserves considerably more attention than it has hitherto received at the hands of Maupassant scholars. The two letters given below,<sup>5</sup> published for the first time, constitute the earliest evidence of a friendship which was to last for twenty-five years, until Maupassant's death in 1893.

Louis Le Poittevin was the son of Alfred and Louise Le Poittevin. Louise Lé Poittevin (*née* de Maupassant) was a sister of Guy's father, Gustave de Maupassant, who had married Alfred's sister, Laure Le Poittevin, the same year that Alfred married Gustave's sister, in 1846. Louis was born on May 22, 1847,<sup>6</sup> at La Neuville-Champ-d'Oisel (Seine-Inférieure). His father's death in 1848 ended the closest possible friendship with Gustave Flaubert, whose affection for Alfred's nephew, Guy, was considerably enhanced by the young man's striking resemblance to his uncle.<sup>7</sup>

In addition to the family ties indicated above, the fact that both Guy and Louis were intensely interested in letters and were themselves writing poetry very naturally brought the two young men closer together. Louis eventually abandoned law altogether and devoted himself exclusively to painting, a field in which he at-

<sup>5</sup> From the present writer's collection, in a group of Maupassant letters originally in the collection of the famous bibliophile, Jules Le Petit. These letters constituted lot 2143 in the Le Petit sale of 1918, described as followed in the sale catalogue:

"Correspondance de Guy de Maupassant avec M. et Mme Louis Le Poittevin, réunion de trente-trois lettres et billets autographes signés de Guy de Maupassant"

"Correspondance amicale renfermant de nombreux renseignements intéressants sur Guy de Maupassant, sur son frère, la succession de son père et de sa mère, ses divers déplacements à Etretat, dans le midi de la France et en Italie."

"On y a joint une intéressante lettre de Louis Le Poittevin à Maupassant."

These letters were later acquired by the well-known Paris dealer, Pierre Berès, from whom they were subsequently acquired by the present writer

<sup>6</sup> *La Grande Encyclopédie* erroneously gives the date as May 21, 1852. Cf. Dumesnil, *loc. cit.*, p. 70.

<sup>7</sup> About this resemblance Flaubert wrote to Guy's mother, in the following terms: "Ton fils me rappelle tant mon pauvre Alfred! J'en suis même parfois effrayé, surtout lorsqu'il baisse la tête, en récitant des vers!" (Quoted by Maynal, E., *La Vie et l'œuvre de Guy de Maupassant*, Paris, Mercure de France, 1906, p. 30).

tained prominence as a landscape artist. When, in 1884, he had an attractive house built on the rue Montchanin, near aristocratic Place Malesherbes, Maupassant moved into the ground-floor apartment and remained there for nearly six years.

# GUY DE MAUPASSANT TO LOUIS LE POITTEVIN

Etretat,<sup>8</sup> ce dimanche [April, 1868] \*

Cher Cousin,

Je profite de mes quelques jours de vacances pour t'écrire, car il y a tant de temps que nous ne nous sommes pas vus, que tu ne dois pas savoir si je suis mort ou vivant, d'un autre côté j'ai perdu beaucoup de temps les années dernières, de sorte que je n'ai pas une minute à moi à Yvetot,<sup>10</sup> il faut travailler sans cesse si je veux réussir à mes examens, et je dois attendre les quelques moments de repos que me donnent les vacances pour écrire à ceux qui me sont chers. Il y a vraiment une sorte de fatalité qui nous empêche de nous voir. Quand j'ai été à Rouen à la fin des grandes vacances dernières, tu n'y étais pas; et lorsque ma mère et ma tante vous ont vus à La Neuville j'étais enfermé dans mon cloître d'Yvetot. Je ne sais si tu connais cette baraque, couvent triste où règnent les curés, l'hypocrisie, l'ennui, etc., etc., et d'où s'exhale une odeur de soutane qui se répand dans toute la ville d'Yvetot et qu'on garde malgré soi les premiers jours de vacances; pour m'en débarrasser je viens de lire un ouvrage de J. J. Rousseau. Je ne connaissais pas la Nouvelle Héloïse et ce livre m'a servi en même temps de désinfectant et de pieuse lecture pour la semaine sainte.

Je ne sais si tu as appris que notre cousin Marcel Le Poittevin<sup>11</sup> de Cherbourg arrive ici mardi, avec sa femme et ses enfants, pour passer quelques jours avec nous. Je me promets bien de le mener bon gré mal gré dans les falaises pour lui faire connaître les environs, car je suis seul et cela m'ennuie de faire des excursions sans compagnons. Pourquoi donc ne viens-tu pas nous voir, je te mènerais dans des vallées et des bois inconnus aux profanes, auprès des sources qui jaillissent de nos grands rochers, et là, en présence de la belle nature, tu pourrais faire quelque jolie pièce de vers.

<sup>8</sup> On the Normandy coast, where the Maupassants owned a villa, "Les Verguies."

<sup>9</sup> In the most extensive published collection of Maupassant letters (cf note 1, above), there is but one letter written by Maupassant before 1870.

<sup>10</sup> Disliking Yvetot, Guy managed to be absent as frequently as possible, sometimes pretending illness, and at least once contriving to get himself dismissed for infraction of school rules. On March 16, 1866, his mother wrote Flaubert, " . . . il ne se plaisait guère là-bas, l'austérité de cette vie de cloître allait mal à sa nature impressionnable et fine, et le pauvre enfant étouffait derrière ces hautes murailles qui ne laissaient arriver aucun bruit du dehors" (*Op cit* in note 1 above, p. 430).

<sup>11</sup> Son of Eugène Le Poittevin?

Je sais que tu n'as pas besoin de cela pour faire de beaux vers, mais je t'assure que ces spectacles t'en inspireraient de plus beaux encore, et j'aurais du moins quelqu'un avec qui me promener.

Avant de finir ma lettre j'ai une demande à t'adresser, et j'espère que tu ne refuseras pas. On vient de me donner un album où je mets les photographies de mes parents et de mes amis, et à ce double titre je désire y mettre la tienne et celle d'Armand<sup>12</sup> aussi. Je vous prie de bien vouloir me les envoyer, ma mère me charge de demander celle de ma tante Louise<sup>13</sup>. Adieu, cher Louis, ma mère et mon frère<sup>14</sup> se joignent à moi pour t'embrasser ainsi qu'Armand et ta mère. Nous serrons affectueusement la main à mon oncle<sup>15</sup>.

Guy de Maupassant

# LOUIS LE POITTEVIN TO GUY DE MAUPASSANT

La Neuville, ce 16 avril, 1868

Mon cher Guy,

Ta lettre m'a rendu bien heureux; cette marque d'amitié que tu me témoignes me fait assez voir que ton cœur ne connaît point l'absence et que malgré la distance qui nous sépare il ne craint pas de venir quelquefois faire comprendre aux habitants de La Neuville qu'il ne les oublie pas.

Il y a, comme tu le dis, bien longtemps que nous ne nous sommes vus, et cela m'est d'autant plus pénible que nous sommes unis par le sang et par l'amitié, que nos goûts semblent les mêmes et que nos caractères fraterniseraient indubitablement. Je ne puis penser sans une sorte de serrement de cœur que nous pourrions nous rencontrer dans une rue et, peut-être, ne pas nous reconnaître, car tu dois avoir bien grandi et par conséquent avoir changé depuis que nous nous sommes trouvés ensemble à Boinambusc. Une sorte de fatalité, dis-tu dans ta lettre, nous écarte, nous sépare l'un de l'autre. Eh bien, tu sais quelle elle est, cette fatalité. Réfléchis, tu la connaîtras comme moi. D'un côté tu trouveras le cloître et de l'autre la faculté de droit.

<sup>12</sup> Armand Cord'homme, step-brother of Louis.

<sup>13</sup> Mother of Louis.

<sup>14</sup> Hervé de Maupassant, six years younger than Guy.

<sup>15</sup> Charles Cord'homme, whom Louise Le Poittevin had married after the death of her first husband, Alfred Le Poittevin. Charles Cord'homme inspired the unforgettable Cornudet in *Boule de Suif*. A copy of the *Soirées de Médan*, where Maupassant's famous story first appeared, was inscribed by Maupassant as follows:

A mon aimable cousin,  
Lucie Le Poittevin et à mon cher cousin,  
beau-fils de Cornudet lui-même  
Leur bien dévoué

Guy de Maupassant

The above copy of *Les Soirées de Médan* was sold at the Suzannet sale in 1938 (No. 12). Lucie was Louis' wife.

Voilà les deux seuls obstacles à notre réunion; sans eux nous pourrions nous serrer plus souvent la main, gravir les rochers escarpés d'Étiéat ou marcher au fond des bois de La Neuville, causer, rire, chanter, faire des vers ensemble, passe-temps délicieux et remède sans pareil contre l'ennui et la fatigue que cause le droit à l'esprit

Tu sentiras aussi, j'en suis sûr, tout le positif de cette science, toute son aridité, quand, après avoir terminé tes études littéraires, tu te mettras à cultiver le *code*. Ton esprit passionné pour les lettres ne se courbera pas en un jour à ce travail.<sup>16</sup> J'ai senti bien souvent pendant des mois entiers le mien prêt à se révolter et je ne sais véritablement pas comment j'ai continué une étude qui était si en désaccord avec mon caractère. La poésie en effet cherche les illusions, et il n'y a rien de moins propre à en procurer que les recueils de jurisprudence

Je te prie toutefois de ne pas prendre entièrement à la lettre tout ce que je te dis à ce sujet, il y a longtemps que mon cœur est loin d'affectionner cette étude et il a probablement été un peu loin dans son effusion

Il est trop certain que nous ne pourrons nous voir encore cette année; tu vas rentrer dans ton cloître, moi dans mon *corpus juris civilis* et le temps se passera sans nous voir réunis

Enfin, j'espère être plus heureux l'an prochain; d'un côté mon droit sera terminé, de l'autre tes examens de baccalauréat seront passés, et ces deux obstacles disparaissant nous célébrerons par une pièce de vers le jour qui nous verra la main dans la main

Tu me demandes ma photographie, cher cousin, je ne l'ai pas, sans quoi tu n'aurais pas été obligé de me la demander, allant au devant de tes désirs je te l'aurais envoyée depuis longtemps. Aussitôt que j'en posséderai de nouvelles, tu en recevras une; quant à mon frère, il en a je crois encore et il t'en fera parvenir une—ma mère aussi ne vous oubliera pas.

Tout à toi,

Le Poittevin

This moving exchange of letters, containing as it does the only personal glimpse we have of Maupassant between the ages of fourteen and twenty, also clarifies an important point in the author's biography. The exact years of his stay at the "cloître d'Yvetot," and his subsequent studies in Rouen have been heretofore in a maze of obscurity, the result of conflicting circumstantial evidence.

Ironically enough, the confusion was probably started quite unintentionally by Maupassant himself when he wrote, in his *Souvenirs sur Louis Bouilhet*, "J'avais seize ans . . . j'étais élève au collège de

<sup>16</sup> Maupassant's study of law was interrupted by the Franco-Prussian war. He continued it after the end of hostilities, but apparently did not complete his studies. His student identification-card for the year 1872-1873 at the "Faculté de Droit de Paris" is in the present writer's Maupassant collection.

Rouen en ce temps-là . . .”<sup>17</sup> Since Maupassant was born on August 5, 1850, his statement was naturally interpreted to mean that he was studying in Rouen in 1866. And that inference was strengthened by the publication of a letter from Mme Laure de Maupassant to Gustave Flaubert, written on March 16, 1866, in which Guy's mother told her old friend:

Je viens d'être obligée de le retirer de la maison religieuse d'Yvetot, où l'on m'a refusé une dispense de maigre exigée par les médecins. . . . Je crois que je vais le mettre au lycée du Havre pour dix-huit mois et que j'irai ensuite m'établir à Paris pour les années de rhétorique et de philosophie.<sup>18</sup>

Presumably on the basis of the foregoing evidence, the leading French historian of Maupassant states, “. . . à la rentrée de 1867 il est à Rouen en rhétorique, l'année suivante en philosophie.”<sup>19</sup>

The letters exchanged between Maupassant and Louis Le Poitevin in 1868, published now for the first time, clarify at last this important detail of Guy's school career. He was still at the “couvent triste” in the spring of 1868; he did not go to Rouen until the fall of 1868. He was therefore enrolled at Rouen for one year rather than two, as it has been believed heretofore. Maupassant's statement that he was in Rouen at the age of sixteen? Surely a lapse of memory (nearly twenty years after the event) or a slip of the pen. His mother's declaration that she had removed him from the “cloître d'Yvetot” in 1866? Maupassant must indeed have been removed from that school in the spring of 1866; but he must as certainly have been sent back somewhat later, according to official records available: there are two formal reports on Guy from the “Institution Ecclésiastique d'Yvetot” for the year 1886-1887, the second of which eloquently describes the seventeen-year old student as “toujours bon et agréable”!<sup>20</sup> Since a first report from the same institution, covering the school-year 1863-1864, is also available,<sup>21</sup> as well as the earliest known Maupassant letter, written on May 2, 1864, near the end of his first year at Yvetot,<sup>22</sup> the conclusion is inevitable that Maupassant spent, with an occasional prolonged absence, five years at that “couvent

<sup>17</sup> *Le Gaulois*, 4 décembre 1884

<sup>20</sup> *Op cit.*, in note 1 above, p. 428

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *op cit.*, in note 1 above, p. 430

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 427.

<sup>19</sup> *Op. cit.*, in note 4 above, p. 89.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 195-96.



triste," between 1863 and 1868, and that he spent only the year 1868-1869 at Rouen.<sup>23</sup>

ARTINE ARTINIAN

*Bard College*

# FIRST PUBLICATION OF MAUPASSANT'S PAPA DE SIMON

The date of first publication of *Le Papa de Simon*, one of Maupassant's best stories, has hitherto eluded Maupassant historians, including the leading French authority of the author of *Boule de Suif*, who edited, between 1934 and 1938, the scholarly and beautiful edition of Maupassant's complete works. In the last volume of that edition (published by the Librairie Gründ, rather than by the Librairie de France, which had issued the previous fourteen volumes), M. René Dumesnil included an extremely useful table of Maupassant's works, "classés suivant l'ordre de leur composition et de leur publication."<sup>1</sup> *Le Papa de Simon* is listed in that table as first appearing in book form in 1881, in Maupassant's first volume of stories, *La Maison Tellier*, with a note to the effect that it had previously appeared in print. But nowhere in that list is it indicated when or where that famous story had originally been published.

<sup>23</sup> Francis Steegmuller, author of *Flaubert and Madame Bovary*, now at work on a study of Maupassant, wrote to the *lycée* of Rouen in an attempt to get at official records, but received no reply. A friend of Mr. Steegmuller's reported that the school had been occupied by the Germans and that its records were in disorder. The same friend discovered a hitherto unknown article on Maupassant published by Georges Dubosc in the August, 1893, number of "La Normandie," which contains the following interesting information:

"En octobre 1868, il entre au Lycée de Rouen, y fait sa philosophie de 1868 à 1869. En juillet 1869, il obtient son Baccalauréat (avec la mention: passable) et obtient lors de la distribution des prix les récompenses suivantes.

dissertation française	4e accessit
dissertation latine	do
version latine	do."

Unfortunately, M. Dubosc did not state the source of the above information. We are very much obliged to Mr. Steegmuller for communicating these details to us.

<sup>1</sup>Chroniques, études, correspondance de Guy de Maupassant, Paris, Librairie Gründ, 1938, pp. 441-457.

Ignorance of that important detail seems the more striking, since Maupassant's published correspondence contains two references to *Le Papa de Simon*. In a letter to Robert Pinchon, written in February, 1877, Maupassant wrote to his close friend, "*Le Papa de Simon* va paraître au mois de juin dans une revue bête."<sup>2</sup> Nearly two years later (December, 1878), in a letter to another friend, Léon Fontaine, he writes, "La revue qui a pour titre *La Réforme* me doit cinquante francs pour mon *Papa de Simon*."<sup>3</sup> However, the Maupassant student searching in the files of *La Réforme* for 1878, or 1877, is doomed to disappointment, for *Le Papa de Simon* does not appear in either of those two, or previous, volumes of that publication.

The following Maupassant letter in our collection, published now for the first time, led us to the solution of this bibliographic problem:

Paris, le 15 X<sup>bre</sup> 1879

MINISTÈRE  
DE L'INSTRUCTION  
PUBLIQUE  
ET DES BEAUX-ARTS

—  
SECRÉTARIAT  
—

1<sup>er</sup> Bureau

Cher Monsieur,

M. Lassez m'ayant dit de venir vers le milieu du mois de X<sup>bre</sup> pour toucher le montant de ma nouvelle publiée dans la *Réforme*, je me suis présenté hier à votre bureau, mais vous veniez de vous en aller.

Comme je vais m'absenter pendant les fêtes de Noël et du jour de l'An, j'ai l'intention d'aller vous demander, vendredi, vers cinq heures, de vouloir bien régler ce petit compte

Merci pour le manuscrit que j'ai repris hier.

Croyez, je vous prie, cher Monsieur, à mes sentiments affectueux et dévoués

Guy de Maupassant

An examination of *La Réforme* for the year 1879 revealed that *Le Papa de Simon* appeared in the December 1, 1879, number of that publication, pp. 166-173.

ARTINE ARTINIAN

Bard College

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 226.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 256.

## A HUGO "PASTICHE"

In the process of gathering material for a study of the personal and literary relations of Victor Hugo and Auguste Vacquerie, I have come upon an article by one Arthur de Gravillon entitled "Hugo et Vacquerie. Pardonnez-Nous!"<sup>1</sup> which, so far as I have been able to determine, has escaped the attention of Hugolians. A foot-note to the article, obviously written by one of the editors of the *Revue*, tells us: "Nous recevons et nous publions avec empressement le récit d'une charmante mystification faite par deux de nos collaborateurs, M. l'abbé Dauphin et M. Arthur de Gravillon, aux dépens de deux gloires de différentes grandeurs, Mm. Hugo et Vacquerie. Quand on pastiche aussi complètement les grands écrivains, c'est qu'on est de leur famille." The article, written "sous l'invocation de mon ami Alfred Busquet," relates a trip taken by Gravillon and the abbé Dauphin to "la vallée du Lys" near Bagnères-de-Luchon in the Pyrenees. At the bottom of this valley are two cascades known as "le Cœur" and "l'Enfer." In a nearby inn there was a register in which visitors wrote their impressions, serious or facetious. The abbé Dauphin composed a sixteen-line poem, in the style of Hugo, on the grandeur of the site; Gravillon copied the poem into the register and signed Hugo's name. Then the abbé wrote in it the following quatrain, to which he signed the name of Auguste Vacquerie:

Dans ce temple, ô poète, ô sublime grand-prêtre,  
Près de toi, moi chétif, à quel titre paraître?  
Tu l'exiges!—Eh bien, je réclame l'honneur  
D'agiter l'encensoir comme un enfant de chœur

Twenty years later Gravillon re-visited this spot, in the company of his wife. He asked for the register at the inn, and looked in vain for the two poems. He was then told by the inn-keeper that the poems had brought him both money and honor and would have made a very wealthy man of him had they not been stolen by an Englishman who had offered twenty guineas for them and been refused. The inn-keeper, believing the poems to be authentic, had copied them from the register, and many other copies had been made

<sup>1</sup> *Revue du Lyonnais, recueil historique et littéraire*, troisième série, XI (Lyon, 1871), 171-179.

before their disappearance. Worried lest Hugo and Vacquerie discover the counterfeits, Gravillon asked Alfred Busquet, who had introduced him into the Hugo home in Paris while the poet was in exile, to intercede on his behalf. Recalling with pleasure the evening he had spent in the company of Charles Hugo and Auguste Vacquerie, he closes his article with the words: "Allons! saint Alfred, priez pour nous, et vous, divins Hugo et Vacquerie, pardonnez-nous!"<sup>1</sup>

The Hugo "pastiche," written into the register of the inn in the "vallée du Lys," runs as follows:

O pics, clochers du monde où sonne la tempête,  
Cadrans d'où l'avalanche à toute heure mugit,  
Devant qui l'homme à peine ose lever la tête  
Tant Dieu lui paraît grand, tant il se semble petit.  
  
O rocs, âpres sommets, vieux autels de granit  
D'où le nuage fume, encens de notre terre!  
Vieille abside où se chante en chœur le grand mystère,  
Abords d'un autre monde où le nôtre finit!  
Vieux torrents qui sifflez dans vos tuyaux de pierre,  
Vieux lichens qui des troncs comme un lustre pendez;  
Vieux lézards des rochers qui, pensifs, entendez  
Les bruits d'eau, voix de Dieu, qui tombent de la cime,  
Vieux glaciers qui là-haut reluisez au soleil  
Comme sur les gradins luit le flambeau vermeil!  
Vous formez un grand temple où mon esprit s'abîme  
Et sent de l'infin l'extatique sommeil.

AARON SCHAFER

*The University of Texas*

---

#### AN UNSIGNED ARTICLE BY CHATEAUBRIAND

The Indian ruins or mounds on the Ohio River apparently interested Chateaubriand very much. He spoke of them in detail in the *Géne du Christianisme*<sup>1</sup> and in the *Voyage en Amérique*.<sup>2</sup> In

<sup>1</sup> See Part One, Book Four, Chapter Two of the *Géne du Christianisme* and especially Note VIII in the back of the book. In the first edition of the *Géne*, this is note F.

<sup>2</sup> See the chapter entitled "Journal sans date" of the *Voyage en Amérique*. There is also a reference to Indian mounds in the next chapter.

both *Les Martyrs*<sup>3</sup> and in *Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem*<sup>4</sup> he compared the pyramids of Egypt to the Indian mounds of Ohio.

It will be of interest to Chateaubriand scholars to know that the first appearance of this theme occurs in an unsigned article by Chateaubriand in the *Meicure de France* of October 8, 1801.

A letter written by Chateaubriand to Fontanes and dated October 2, 1801 begins as follows:

Vous voyez mon cher ami, mon empressement à vous servir. Je vous envoie mes ruines de l'Ohio et je leur mets un titre qui les présente *comme un simple extrait de l'œuvre de M. de Crèveœur*. J'en ai retenu toutes les réflexions et n'ai laissé que la matière sèche. Signez le tout d'une *lettre* quelconque et tout ira bien.<sup>5</sup>

The article which appeared six days later in *Mercur de France* bore the title: *Discussion historique sur les ruines trouvées au bord de l'Ohio dans l'Amérique septentrionale, et dont il est parlé dans le Voyage en Pensylvanie de M. de Crèveœur*.<sup>6</sup> It was signed "Un Canadien."

There can be no doubt that this article is by Chateaubriand especially since he repeated the material almost word for word in the *Génie du Christianisme* which was published only a few months later.

The original version differs from the material in the *Génie du Christianisme* only in very minor details except for one place where there is a change of content. This change occurred when Chateaubriand was trying to explain the approximate date of the existence of the people who created the Indians mounds.

Nous avons vu sur ces ruines un chêne décrépit, qui avait poussé sur les débris d'un autre chêne tombé à ses pieds, et dont il ne restait plus que l'écorce, celui-ci à son tour s'était élevé sur un troisième. L'emplacement du dernier se marquait encore par l'intersection de deux cercles, d'un aubier rouge et pétrifié, qu'on découvrait à fleur-de-terre, en écartant un épais

<sup>3</sup> See note 29 of Chapter XI of *Les Martyrs*.

<sup>4</sup> See Book VI of *Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem*. In the critical edition by Emile Malakis, published by the Johns Hopkins Press in 1946, it is on pages 223 and 224 of Vol 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Correspondance Générale de Chateaubriand* par Louis Thomas, Champion, Paris, 1912, I, 57. The italics in the quotation are in the original letter.

<sup>6</sup> *Voyage dans la haute Pensylvanie et dans l'Etat de New York* by Michel Guillaume St. Jean de Crèveœur published by Maradan, Paris, 1801.

humus composé de feuilles et de mousse. Accordez seulement deux siècles de vie à ces trois chênes successifs, et voilà une époque de six cents années, que la nature a gravée sur ces ruines

The author must have felt that six hundred years was not long enough because he changed this passage in the *Génie du Christianisme* to read as follows:

Nous avons vu sur ces ruines un chêne décrépît qui avait poussé sur les débris d'un autre chêne tombé à ses pieds, et dont il ne restait plus que l'écorce, celui-ci à son tour s'était élevé sur un troisième et ce troisième sur un quatrième. L'emplacement des deux derniers se maquait encore par l'intersection de deux cercles d'un aubier rouge et pétrifié, qu'on découvrait à fleur de terre, en écartant un épais humus composé de feuilles et de mousses. Accordez seulement trois siècles de vie à ces quatre chênes successifs, et voilà une époque de douze cents années que la nature a gravée sur ces ruines.

A study of Crèveœur's book reveals the fact that Chateaubriand did not take all his material on Indian mounds from that book, but the *Voyage en Pensylvanie* may be considered as a minor source of Chateaubriand material and the article in the *Mercur de France* the first appearance of material on Indian mounds.

HOBART RYLAND

*University of Kentucky*

## ALCESTE AND JOAN OF KENT

In a recent article, "Chaucer's Hopeless Love,"<sup>1</sup> Miss Margaret Galway has attempted to bolster her previously-proposed identification of Alceste in *The Legend of Good Women* with Joan, Princess of Wales, Richard II's mother. In an earlier article, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady,"<sup>2</sup> Miss Galway presented in considerable detail arguments for identifying Alceste with Joan, primarily on the basis of an interpretation of Alceste's speech to the God of Love (F 342-413) in the light of Richard's strained relations with his half-brother, John Holland, another of Joan's sons, in the summer of 1385. More recently, however, Miss Galway has abandoned this interpretation and has attempted to relate Alceste's speech to

<sup>1</sup> In *MLN*, 60 (1945), 431-39.

<sup>2</sup> In *MLR*, 33 (1938), 145-99.

accounts in contemporary chronicles of Joan's intervention in affairs of state in 1385, pointing out correctly that proof of her assertion would do much to support her other Joan identifications. I propose in this article to present for closer examination the passages in the chronicles cited by Miss Galway upon which she has based her identification.

In order to consider the validity of her assertion it is necessary to review briefly Alceste's speech in the passage referred to. It can be divided, for analysis, into five paragraphs:

(1) A god ought to be gracious and merciful and ought to beware of flatterers and false accusers of which his court is always full, men who out of envy will do others harm. Such men are always in the house of Cesar (345-61)

(2) A good lord weighs each case, he is not "lik tirauntz of Lumbardy"; but a natural king, that is, one by right, is considerate of his lieges, who represent "gold in cofre" (373-83)

(3) A god is respectful of his lords' positions and honors them as half-gods (384-7)

(4) But he is considerate as well of the poor of lower degrees and does not wreak harsh justice simply because he is strong, he weighs each case and rewards and punishes justly. (388-99)

(5) A god ought to accept a man's apology, considering not only the culprit's crime but his position as well, remembering that the man has served him faithfully. (400-13)

The temptation to read into these lines some contemporary significance, especially in the light of their applicability to Richard II's tempestuous relations with the nobles of his realm, particularly with his royal uncles, is strong, but Miss Galway's assertion that the passage is derived from a speech Joan delivered to Richard at a time when his relations with his uncles were approaching open civil war does not appear to be supported by the evidence.

In tracing Alceste's speech to the God of Loye to an incident in Joan's life recorded in certain of the chronicles, Miss Galway has stated very positively: "Enough of her historic speech on that occasion is preserved in contemporary chronicles, and has now been found to show that it is Alceste's speech on a king's duties, to discountenance flatterers; to deal justly with his lieges; and to give due respect to the nobles nearest to him in status and kinship, and so on, every word speaking to the point to which Joan had spoken." \* Miss Galway did not support her contention with quotations from

\* Galway, *MLN*, 60 (1945), 435.

these chronicles, but she cited Malverne's supplement to the *Polychronicon* of Ralph Higden, (Rolls Series), ix, 55-8, the *Historia Anglicana*, (Rolls Series), ii, 112-26, and the *Chronicon Adae de Usk*. A study of these reveals, however, that none of them comes near to preserving Joan's speech; in the first two she is not quoted, and the third quotes one sentence, attribution of which to Joan is questionable. The pertinent passages are these:

1 From the *Polychronicon*

Mater quidem regis de his certiorata nimio dolore et stupore turbata celeriter festinavit ad regem suadens ei semper discordias suorum nobilium evitare praesertim ducis Lancastriae et fratrum suorum qui patrui ei existunt. Igitur ad ejus suum vito die Marti venit Westmonasterium cum magna militum comitura. Mater regis confestim accessit ad ducem Lancastriae et ita cum inflexit quod eum ad regem adduxit, cujus etiam mediatione protinus sunt ad invicem concordati. Remisit etiam dux Lancastriae ad rogatum domini regis iracundiam suam quam erga quosdam dominos regi familiares gerebat. Et fuerunt hi comes Sarum, comes Oxoniae, comes Notyngham, aliique fuerunt quo nondum protulerunt ad eo protunc remissionis gratiam obtinere.<sup>4</sup>

(The king's mother, however, better informed in these matters, troubled by excessive grief and amazement, hastened to persuade the king that he ought always to avoid the quarrels of his nobles, especially those of the duke of Lancaster and his brother, who were his paternal uncles. Therefore, in order to persuade him, she came on the sixth day of March to Westminster accompanied by a large company of soldiers. The king's mother immediately approached the duke of Lancaster and so influenced him that he betook himself to the king, by whose mediation they were forthwith reconciled. Further, the duke of Lancaster remitted, at the entreaty of his lord, the king, his anger against certain lords who were friendly to the king, and these were the earl of Salisbury, the earl of Oxford, the earl of Nottingham; and there were others who were not able to obtain from him the favor of amnesty.)

2 From the *Historia Anglicana*

Sed tantum discrimen regni ferre non sustenens Domina Johanna, mater Regis, quamvis tera foret et delicata, et, prae corporis sui sagina, semetipsam vix portare valeret, neglecta tamen corporis sui quietudine, laboriosum iter, nunc ad Regem, nunc ad Ducem, gratis assumpsit, nihil parcens expensis, nihil humilibus precibus, donec, voti compos effecta, inter eosdem pacem et concordiam reformasset.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *Polychronicon* Ranulphi Higden, *Monachi Castrensis*, J. R. Lumby, ed., London, 1886, ix (Continuation of the *Polychronicon* by John Malverne), 58-7.

<sup>5</sup> *Thomae Walsingham, Historia Anglicana*, H. R. Riley, ed., London, 1864, ii, 126.



(But Princess Joan, the mother of the king, unable to tolerate so great a division of sovereignty, although she was obese and ill, and because of the fatness of her body was scarcely able to support her own weight, nevertheless, heedless of her own physical comfort, voluntarily took upon herself the laborious journey, now to the king, now to the duke, sparing neither expense nor humble entreaty, until, the expression of a pledge having been effected, she re-established peace and harmony between them.)

3 From the *Chronicon Adae de Usk*

Hearing this, our lady, the princess, the mother of the king, with heavy grief in her heart, and not sparing to toil on even by night, hastened from Wallingford to London, to allay the discord. And on her knees she prayed the king her son, as he looked for her blessing, in no wise to bend to the wishes of flatterers, and especially of those who were now urging him on, otherwise he would bring down her curse upon him. But the king with reverence raised her up and promised that he would willingly be guided by the counsel of the twelve. To whom his mother replied: "At thy coronation, my son, I rejoiced that it had fallen to my lot to be the mother of an anointed king, but now I grieve for I foresee the fall which threatens thee, the work of accursed flatterers." The king then passed with his mother to Westminster Hall, and there, seated on his throne of state, by her mediation, made his peace with the twelve guardians, yet did he it falsely and with deceit.<sup>6</sup>

If this single sentence quoted above is the "speech" which Miss Galway sees as the source of Alceste's lecture, and apparently it is this alone she referred to, her argument is weak indeed. And even weaker does it become when one recognizes that the passage in Usk's chronicle is highly suspicious and untrustworthy. For example, he dated this event in 1387, and Joan had died in August, 1385. In his account Usk confused several elements of incidents occurring at various times. And no other chronicler has preserved any such remarks as those attributed here to Joan.<sup>7</sup>

WALTER E. WEESE

New Haven, Conn

## TWO CRUXES IN THE POETRY OF DONNE

Of the many cruxes in the poetry of Donne, two of the most difficult and widely disputed are the famous "specular stone" and the puzzling ending of *The Progresse of the Soule*. In the case of

<sup>6</sup> *Chronicon Adae de Usk*, A D 1377-1421, ed with translation and notes by Sir E M Thompson, K C B, 2nd ed, London, 1904, 143-4 (Latin text, p. 5)

<sup>7</sup> See Thompson's note on this passage, ed. cited, p 144.

both of these difficult spots in Donne's poetry, the evidence presented by his sermons can be of considerable value in arriving at a correct understanding of his words.<sup>1</sup>

In regard to the "specular stone," two relevant passages exist; the first, in *The undertaking*, is as follows:

It were but madnes now t'impart  
The skill of specular stone,  
When he which can have learn'd the art  
To cut it, can finde none.<sup>2</sup>

The second is less detailed, as he tells the Countess of Bedford, in a verse letter, that.

You teach (though wee learne not) a thing unknowne  
To our late times, the use of specular stone,  
Through which all things within without were shown  
Of such were Temples, so and of such you are.<sup>3</sup>

Grierson, in a note on the passage in *The undertaking*, states his belief that Donne is here referring to the practice of crystal gazing, basing his argument upon the old name for crystal gazers, "specularii," and comes to the conclusion that it may be a reference to Dr. Dee's magic mirrors.<sup>4</sup> Norton, on the other hand, views the passage as an allusion to "various sorts of translucent stone, such as alabaster and mica."<sup>5</sup> That Norton, and not Grierson, is fundamentally correct was indicated in a recent article by Professor Don Cameron Allen,<sup>6</sup> and, as further proof, a passage from a sermon preached at Whitehall in 1627 reveals conclusively what Donne had in mind:

*The heathens served their Gods in Temples, sub die, without roofs or coverings, in a free opennesse, and, where they could, in Temples made of Specular stone, that was transparent as glasse, or crystall, so that they which walked without in the streets, might see all that was done within.<sup>7</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> This article is part of a larger study, now in progress, of the poems and sermons of Donne.

<sup>2</sup> *The Poems of John Donne*, edited by Herbert J. C. Grierson, 2 vols., Oxford, 1912, I, 10, ll 5-8.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 219, ll 28-31.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 12-13.

<sup>5</sup> *The Poems of John Donne*, New York, 1895, I, 217-18.

<sup>6</sup> "Donne's Specular Stone," *MLN*, LXI (1946), 63-64.

<sup>7</sup> *Fifty Sermons*, 1649, No. 27, p. 230.

This passage certainly explains the line, "Through which all things within without were shown," and the reference to the temples in the letter to the Countess of Bedford, and it also clarifies, to a considerable extent, the allusion in *The undertaking*. References to the art of cutting the specular stone, as well as a more detailed explanation of its properties, are to be found in the Holland translation of Pliny, which may well have served Donne as the source of the passages in his poetry and prose already quoted. The passage, which follows, contains a marginal notation, *Specularis lapis*:

As touching Talc (which also goeth in the name of a stone) it is by nature much more easie to be cloven into as thin flakes as a man will This kind of glasse stone, the hither part of Spaine onely in old time did afford us, and the same not all throughout, but within the compasse of a hundred miles, namely about the citie Sagobrica but in these we have it from Cypros, Cappadocia, and Sicilie, and of late also it hath been found in Barbarie. howbeit, the best glasse-stone commeth from Spaine and Cappadocia, for it is the tendrest and carrieth largest pannels, although they do not altogether the clearest, but somewhat duskish There be also of them in Italy about Bononia, but the same bee short and small, full of spots also and joyned to peeces of flint, and yet it seemeth that in nature they bee much like unto those that in Spaine be digged out of pits which they sinke to a great depth In the daies of *Nero* late Emperour there was found in Cappadocia a stone as hard as marble, white and transparent and shining through, yea even on that side where it hath certaine reddish streakes or spots, in which regard, (for that it is so resplendent) it hath found a name to be called Phengites: Of this stone, the said Emperour caused the temple of *Fortune* to be built called Seia, (which kind *Servius* had first dedicated) comprised within the compasse of *Neroes* golden house and therefore when the doores stood open in the daie time, a man might see within, the day light, after the manner of glasse stones, yet so, as if all the light were within-forth onely, and not let in from the aire thorow the windowes.<sup>8</sup>

It is apparent that Donne has merely an imperfect recollection of this or some other similar passage. Thus he remembers certain salient details, such as the cutting of the stone, the fact that it was found in ancient times in certain places, and also that it was used in the building of temples, but he nowhere gives a clear and complete picture. Still, on the basis of his own words in the sermon already quoted, there can be no doubt as to what he meant by his "specular stone."

<sup>8</sup> *The Historie of the World, commonly called the Naturall Historie of C. Plinius Secundus*, London, 1601, II, xxxvi-22-592.

The disputed passage in *The Progresse of the Soule* occurs at the close of the poem, as Donne states that,

Ther's nothing simply good, nor ill alone,  
Of every quality comparison,  
The onely measure is, and judge, opinion \*

This passage has usually been taken as an example of the extreme scepticism which attracted Donne so strongly during his youth; Bredvold especially makes much of it as an indication of Donne's early scepticism.<sup>10</sup> But a clue to a different interpretation is to be found in the use of the word "simply," in which Donne is obviously making the common distinction between simples and compounds, between that which is simple, complete, with no contrarieties in its nature, and compounds, which are made up of these contrarieties. Hence it is obvious that in this sense only God, who alone implies perfection, is good; all else, the good and evil of this world, is only relatively good or evil, of a mixed nature, partaking to a degree of both qualities. This interpretation is supported by a significant passage from a sermon preached at Whitehall, March 4, 1624/5:

Now this leads us into two rich and fragrant fields; this sets us upon two Hemispheares of the world, the Western Hemispheare, the land of Gold, and Treasure, and the Eastern Hemispheare, the land of Spices and Perfumes, for this puts us upon both these considerations, first, That nothing is Essentially good, but God and then upon this consideration too, That this Essentiall goodnesse of God is so diffusive, so spreading, as that there is nothing in the world that doth not participate of that goodnesse . So that now both these propositions are true, First, That there is nothing in this world good, and then this also, That there is nothing ill . . .<sup>11</sup>

Thus Donne is in this sermon reinforcing the earlier passage in the poem with a direct statement of the reality of all good and evil in this world. And since man must thus be concerned with relative values, opinion is, he says, the proper faculty of judgment. For knowledge, according to Donne, concerns itself with certainties, with absolutes, while opinion, he says, "is a middle station, betweene ignorance and knowledge."<sup>12</sup> To say, therefore, that

\* Grierson, *op. cit.*, I, 316, ll 518-20

<sup>10</sup> Vid especially his article, "The Naturalism of Donne in Relation to Some Renaissance Traditions," *JEGP*, xxii (1923), 471-502.

<sup>11</sup> LXXX *Sermons*, 1640, No. 17, p 167

<sup>12</sup> LXXX *Sermons*, 1640, No. 36, p. 354

opinion is the only measure and judge is not necessarily to give voice to an extreme scepticism, as has usually been thought, opinion, Donne believes, is a useful and necessary state of mind in a world which is by its very nature necessarily relative, and hence here, as so often elsewhere, he expands and clarifies in his sermons a central passage of his earlier poetry.

JOHN P. WENDELL

Warren, Pa

### NEW LIGHT ON THE NASHE-HARVEY QUARREL \*

An interesting piece of evidence which has been overlooked in all accounts of the Nashe-Harvey quarrel, appears in Richard Harvey's *Philadelphus* (1593).<sup>1</sup> This is a book written to defend the historical writings of Geoffrey of Monmouth against the attacks of Buchanan and others, but inserted between two sections of the book is an epistle "To his most loving brother, Master Gabriell Harvey, Doctor of Lawes," in which Richard Harvey takes occasion to refer to the attacks being made against him and his brother:

. I am not wedded to myselfe, nor tyed to any sect in the world, but heartily wish euery man to take euerie thing as it is, not as it is made of this and that scribler or pratler, which can tell better, howe to play the mocking Ape, then the iust controller. Almighty God defend you dayly, and amend them one day You know my minde in all my matters, and that I would those petite Momes had better manners the schollers head without moderation is like the merchantes purse pennilesse without all credite I desire that euerie student may smell as the Lillies of Salomon, and that euerie wilde Lilly may be set in his Gardens. I saye, out Hemlocke, out Bramble, out Weedes, and let the bloud of furious *Asa* himselfe, saith *Ouid*, be turned into a pleasant herbe I write not this, to flatter any that should seeke after me, but to follow you, good Brother, in your *last Letters*, in whose example I euer yet dwelt, and am like to dwell, euen till my Soule shall dwell in the Commonwealth of Heauen. I cannot bid you farewell in a better minde, and in this respect I set me (sic) rest here, I remember your counsell, and beginne my *Essaye*. 1592 the 14. of Iune.

Your loving brother R. H.<sup>2</sup>

\* I am grateful to the trustees of the Folger Shakespeare Library for the grant of a research fellowship for 1947-8, which enabled me to work on this and other studies

<sup>1</sup> For a full bibliographical account of this work, see Thomas Nashe, *Works*, ed. R. B. McKerrow (London, 1910), v, 173.

<sup>2</sup> *Philadelphus*, Sig. Clr-Clv.

*Philadelphus*. In the course of an attack upon the "Saxons" who have attempted to supplant his beloved "Brutans," Harvey declares:

An ape must not come among Churchmen, Serpentes must not dwell in chambers of Counsell, makebates are not in case to cōurse in the dwellings of peaceable Lords, who can abide, to have a deformed mocker with hys distorted mouthes, a venomous hisser with his noysom breath, a rayling stage-player with his trifling actions for his companion?<sup>7</sup>

This is probably, from the nature of its language, a reference to Nashe, though it may be a curiously belated attack on the anti-Marprelate writers as a group. If we accept McKerrow's cogently reasoned argument that Nashe was with Archbishop Whitgift at Craydon during the late summer and autumn of 1592, and was then engaged in the composition of *Summer's Last Will and Testament*,<sup>8</sup> then the probability that this passage is directed at Nashe becomes a very strong one.

SIDNEY THOMAS

*New York City*

## YOUNG FRANCIS BACON'S TUTOR

Some years after the magnificent work of James Spedding had been completed, John Nichol was still compelled to remark that "The first twenty years of Bacon's life are nearly a blank to us."<sup>1</sup> The statement is still true, for almost nothing has been added since that time to relieve the blankness. It is of some interest, therefore, that we are now able to identify without question the man who was perhaps the first tutor of Anthony and Francis Bacon, or who, at any rate, served in that office several years prior to 1573, when the two boys went up to Trinity College, Cambridge.<sup>2</sup> It apparently

<sup>7</sup> *Philadelphus*, Sig N3r.

<sup>8</sup> *Nashe*, v, 19-21.

<sup>1</sup> *Francis Bacon, His Life and Philosophy*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh and London, 1888), I, 33

<sup>2</sup> Recent attempts to penetrate the mystery of Bacon's early education have been made by R. L. Eagle, who conjectures that Sir Anthony Cooke may have been Bacon's tutor (*T L S*, Nov 23, 1946, p. 577), and by S G Thomas and Owen Williams, who argue that Lady Ann Bacon possessed both the serious interest and the competence to teach her sons (*ibid.*, Jan. 23, 1947, p. 51; Feb. 8, 1947, p. 79). But none of these con-

has not hitherto been noticed that in 1578 one John Walsall recorded the fact in his "Epistle Dedicatorie" prefixed to a little work whose title reads "A Sermon Preached at Pavls Crosse by Iohn Walsal, one of the Preachers of Christ his Church in Canterburie. 5. October. 1578. And published at the earnest request of certeine godlie Londoners and others. Neither is he that planteth, any thing, neither he that watereth, but God that gueth increase. I Cor. 3. 7. At London. Printed for G. Byshop." [Colophon: "Imprinted at London by Henrie Middleton for George Byshop."]<sup>3</sup> The epistle is addressed to Francis Bacon's mother, the Lady Ann Bacon, to whom Walsall wished to "make some outward shewe of mine inward heartie thanksgiving for the benefits bestowed upon, and the trust reposed in me your humble and faithfull servant." He then calls to her memory his early connection with the Bacon family.

And when I considered, that by my Lorde and your Ladyship I was first called from the universitie to teach your two sonnes (and those such children, as for the true feare of God, zealous affection to this word, obedience to their parents, reverence to their superiours, humility to their inferiours, love to their instructour, I never knewe any excell them) and also that by the same meanes I was likewise first called from teaching of children, to enstruct men, verely I could not but dedicate the first frutes of these my so generall labours to some of that house, whence I was first sent out to be a poore labourer in the Lords great harvest.<sup>4</sup>

Little is known of John Walsall beyond the usual few facts regarding his university career and the various livings he held. He was a student at Christ Church, Oxford, by 1563, received his B. A. degree June 25, 1566, his M. A. July 9, 1568, and his B. D. June 22 and D. D. July 6, 1584. He was rector of Corton Dinham, Somerset, from 1567 to 1574; canon of Chichester, 1569-71; rector of Lutterworth, Leicestershire, 1569-71; rector of Eastling, Kent, 1574-1617; and vicar of Appledore, Kent, 1590-1609.<sup>5</sup> It may be assumed that he died about 1617.

tributors has offered proof that either Lady Ann or Sir Anthony actually tutored young Anthony and Francis.

\* *STC* records copies only in the Lambeth Palace and the Bodleian libraries. I have used a photostat of the latter copy

\* In all quotations from this text abbreviations have been expanded and the letters *u*, *v*, and *i* have been altered to conform to modern usage.

<sup>5</sup> Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses*.

Some indication of the esteem in which he was held at an early date in his career may be seen in the fact that he was chaplain to the Lord Keeper Bacon and was given dispensation to hold livings in plurality "20 Dec., 1569. Cum Johanne Walsall M. A. Rectore Eccl'ie de Corton Denham Bath & Wells Diocese Capellano d'ni Custodis Magni Sigilli Anglie ad due beneficia."<sup>6</sup> His first living, which according to his account was bestowed upon him by the Lord Keeper, was very probably that of Corton Dinham, Somerset, upon which he entered in 1567. We may assume, therefore, that the period of his employment in the Bacon household must have begun shortly after his graduation from Christ Church on June 25, 1566, when Francis Bacon was between five and six years of age. It is probable that he continued to give instruction to the boys after his appointment to Corton Dinham, possibly until the end of 1569, since at that date he was still known as the Lord Keeper's chaplain. At any rate, there can be little doubt that in John Walsall we have Francis Bacon's first teacher, a man called from Oxford University to undertake the task.

The sermon, which he calls his "first frutes," is the only work he published.<sup>7</sup> The long dedication prefixed to it was obviously designed to please his patroness, the Lady Ann, who was widely known for her extraordinary learning and strict piety, and the sermon itself expounds doctrinal and sectarian ideas which would have been welcome to her.

VIRGIL B. HELTZEL

*Northwestern University*

---

<sup>6</sup> *Notes & Queries for Somerset and Dorset*, XIII (1913), 78

<sup>7</sup> The *STC* is in error in assigning to him *The Life and Death of Jesus Christ* (1607, 1615, 1622). The work is actually a sermon by his son, Samuel Walsall, who was born at Eastling, Kent, in 1575, received the usual four degrees from Cambridge, and was master of Corpus Christi from 1618 until his death on July 31, 1626. He had an elder brother, Thomas Walsall, also a Cambridge man and divine. See Venn and Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*



## A SIDELIGHT ON THE HUME-ROUSSEAU QUARREL

In his *Concise Account* of the quarrel with Rousseau, published in November 1766, Hume informed the reader that the original letters of the controversy were to be deposited in the British Museum and, in January 1767,<sup>1</sup> he wrote from Edinburgh to Dr. Matthew Maty, one of the librarians, to say that he was sending them by his friend Allan Ramsay. Nearly three months later, on 22 April, Dr. Maty replied that the trustees of the Museum had not thought proper to receive the documents.<sup>2</sup>

Greig does not actually say so, but he implies that Maty returned the documents with his letter. That this was not the case may be seen from the following note to an unknown correspondent, which reveals that Hume had not recovered them after a lapse of nine months and that he suspected that Maty had refused them on his own initiative.<sup>3</sup>

Sir,

I doubt not, but you remember, that when I had the pleasure of meeting you at Wickham about two months ago, I mentioned to you the affair of Mr. Rousseau's Letters to me, the Originals of which I had sent to Mr Maty, to be preserved in the Musaeum. As the curators did not think proper to give them place, I wishd to recover Possession of them, and Mr Maty promised to send them to me, But he has always neglected it. I should be much oblig'd to you, if you would put him in mind of it.

I am, Sir, your most obedient and most humble servant,

Secretary of State's Office

David Hume

Saint James's 29 of Oct 1767

P S. I should be glad to know whether Dr Maty ever propos'd the affair to the Curators

It should be added that the documents were apparently returned to Hume at some later date, for they are now among his papers owned by the Royal Society of Edinburgh.

W. T. BANDY

*University of Wisconsin*

<sup>1</sup> Greig, *Letters of David Hume*, Oxford, 1932, ii. 117-18

<sup>2</sup> Burton, *Life and Correspondence of David Hume*, 1846, ii. 359

<sup>3</sup> This note was printed in A. H. Joline's *Meditations of an Autograph Collector*, New York, 1902, p. 237, but is not included in Greig's edition of Hume's letters.

## BURNS AND PEGGY CHALMERS

The young Boston merchant Henry Lee, Jr. (1817-1896), Harvard, 1836, was from April, 1842, to October, 1843, on a grand tour of Great Britain and the Continent. He crossed the Atlantic with Washington Irving and, after a month in England, journeyed north and spent June in Scotland, visiting "the town of Ayr, where Burns lived and loved-," Glasgow, and the Highlands; the end of the month found him in Stirling as the guest of Mr. McMicking, president of the local branch of the Bank of Glasgow. Mrs. McMicking's father(?) had known Burns, and she herself had been a friend of one of his "constant correspondents," so young Lee proceeded to "bleed" her for anecdotes of the poet.

The results,<sup>1</sup> perhaps, are of no great importance in themselves, but where so much is vague and controversial, any stroke, any touch of color, may be of value in assisting to complete and fill in the outline:

It seems Mrs M's father owned the farm at Ellisland that Burns rented, and once dined there on a haggis—and Mrs Louis Hay, who was one of his constant correspondents, was a friend of Mrs M and she had told her much about him, of his love for Highland Mary, whom he had known as a servant in Lord Eglinton's service, and a most excellent and interesting girl—that she felt sure Burns would have been utterly different, had she lived to cherish and support him, that he married Jean Armour because he had promised to, not because she was pretty or sensible or good, for she was neither to a respectable degree, nor was she his bonnie Jean. This was Jean Lorrimer, the "lassie wi' the lint white locks" who was ruined by his admiration and attentions—that she (Mrs M asked her this, she being very young & enthusiastic) herself could never have fallen in love, or even approached the feeling, for with all his appreciation of the beautiful & delicate, his appearance was dark and coarse, and his manners tainted also, and how could it be otherwise, with his early associations and habits, but only needed to be in the company of those who respected themselves to be himself respectful, that once upon leaving her at her door after an evening of great excitement, and when he was inspired by the company in which he had been, he said "Now let us part like an honest lad & lassie, permit me to salute you!" and she lent a deaf ear, and talked on, Burns recoiled, was mortified and checked at once, and ever after respectful & attentive.

---

<sup>1</sup> Henry Lee Shattuck Collection, Boston, Mass. Henry Lee, Stirling, June 30, 1842, to F L Lee, Boston.

A difficulty appears at the very beginning. Patrick Miller (1731-1815), banker and projector, Burns's friend, patron, and landlord, numbered among his five children two daughters, but, so far as the *DNB* indicates, neither of them married a banker named McMicking. Could Henry Lee have heard "father" when Mrs. McMicking said "grandfather"? Or was Mrs. McMicking's father the John Morin of Laggan, who "became proprietor of Ellisland at Martinmas, 1791"? Presumably, in that case, his dining on a haggis took place before his quarrel with Burns over "the condition of the fields and fences."<sup>2</sup> But whether or not Mrs. McMicking, as daughter (or grand-daughter) of Burns's landlord, knew or had met the poet personally, her principal channel of information was her friendship with the former Margaret Chalmers (1763?-1843), who in December, 1788, became the wife of the Edinburgh banker Lewis Hay (dec. 1800), and whose relationship with Burns, once he had become convinced that his suit was hopeless, "ripened into a genuine friendship."<sup>3</sup> Burns wrote to her with unusual freedom but, as nearly all his letters to her are said to have been destroyed,<sup>4</sup> any information from another source as to their relations is of some importance.

The statement that "Highland Mary" had been in the service of Lord Eglinton—the earl who at his countess' instigation subscribed ten guineas to the Kilmarnock edition of Burns's poems<sup>5</sup>—could easily have been confided to Margaret Chalmers in one of the missing letters. Any thin and faint ray of light into this obscure corner of Burns's life, concerning which so much has been written and so little is known, must be of interest, but the comparison between "Highland Mary" and Jean Armour was probably conventional.

The statement concerning "Jean Lorrimer [sic]" is hardly borne out by the facts; she seems to have been "ruined," if that is the proper word, by an unfortunate marriage to a scapegrace long before Burns in his later years addressed her in song as "Chloris."

<sup>2</sup> Simpson, Richard, "Ellisland," *Annual Burns chronicle and club directory*, VII (Jan., 1898), 85-96, esp. 88; Duncan, R., "An Ellisland relic," *Burns chronicle*, XVIII (Jan., 1909), 144-146.

<sup>3</sup> Ferguson, J. De Lancey, *Pride and passion: Robert Burns, 1759-1796*, N. Y., 1939, p. 161.

<sup>4</sup> *The Letters of Robert Burns*, Ed. J. De L. Ferguson, Oxford, 1931, II, 344

<sup>5</sup> Ferguson, 197

Such value as this account possesses probably lies chiefly in the portrayal of Burns's rustic courtship manners. Professor Ferguson remarks. "Apparently it [Burns's friendship with Margaret Chalmers] began, as usual, with love-making, but . . . Margaret gently put a stop to that—probably telling Burns that she was already engaged to Lewis Hay." The anecdote suggests that Margaret was quite capable of dealing with Burns's tentative advances without reference to any *fiancé*, that she was sufficiently self-possessed coolly to ignore his initial step—probably "inspired" by influences additional to and more potent than merely "the company in which he had been"—and that this slightly chilly disregard sufficed to discourage further attempts.

Henry Lee's passage on Burns comes to us, of course, over half a century after the event and at third hand—Margaret Chalmers to Mrs. McMicking, Mrs. M. to Henry Lee, Henry Lee to us—and even at fourth hand when Margaret Chalmers is passing along information conveyed to her by Burns—but the personalities involved are unusually responsible and trustworthy. Margaret Chalmers seems to have been the most intelligent and best balanced, perhaps the most understanding, of Burns's female friends, Mrs. McMicking, whom Henry Lee described as "just like any sensible affectionate mother, full of kindness and interest, and great quietness and real dignity of character," hardly seems to be one merely to repeat random and floating gossip, and Henry Lee, an alert, intelligent, well-informed man, intensely interested in literature and literary men, set down what he had been told while it was still fresh in his memory, probably the very day he heard it.

KENNETH PORTER

*Houston, Texas*

---

#### WHO SUGGESTED THE PLAN FOR BULWER'S *PAUL CLIFFORD*?

Although the first conception was enlarged, Bulwer's *Paul Clifford* began as a political satire, genial and gay, in which notable public figures, chiefly Tories, were to be represented as members of a band of highwaymen. The immediate suggestion for the story came, Bulwer wrote in his preface, from a friend:

For the original idea of Paul Clifford, I am indebted to a gentleman of considerable distinction in literature, and whose kindness to me is one of my most gratifying remembrances<sup>1</sup>

The "original idea" is specifically described as the *à clef* feature, but the friend is not named.

He was identified as William Godwin by Robert, first Earl Lytton, in his biography of his father.<sup>2</sup> Later works have attributed to Godwin the suggestion for the novel, presumably upon Robert Lytton's authority.<sup>3</sup> It is natural that his statement should have been accepted, and the continued attribution of so lively a jest to a humorless writer has been made easier by the existence, in Bulwer's novels, of influences from Godwin's works.

Yet the same Dedicatory Epistle in which the obligation is stated contains a satirical complaint against the Scotch, which Bulwer tempers with a few exceptions:

It is not an easy matter seriously to dislike . . . the country that has produced Burns, Scott, and Campbell—a country, too, by the way, with which you [Alexander Cockburn] claim a connection, and of which the distinguished friend I have mentioned in this epistle is a native<sup>4</sup>

The friend cannot be identified as William Godwin, who was born in Cambridgeshire. Who was he, then? Besides the passages already quoted, the Epistle offers only this, too polite to be very helpful.

It were to be wished that my friend had found leisure himself, among labours more important, to embody his own ideas, or that, in giving me the canvass, he could have given me also his skill to colour and his talent to create.<sup>5</sup>

The person who best satisfies all the conditions—as to birthplace, acquaintance with Bulwer, politically irreverent wit, and all else—

<sup>1</sup> Paul Clifford (London, 1830), Dedicatory Epistle, xvi

<sup>2</sup> *The Life, Letters, and Literary Remains of Edward Bulwer, Lord Lytton* (London, 1883), II, 246-47

<sup>3</sup> T. H. S. Escott, *Edward Bulwer, First Baron Lytton of Knebworth* (London, 1910), 169-70; Michael Sadleir, *Bulwer. a Panorama of Edward and Rosina, 1803-1836* (Boston, 1931), 204; Louis Cazamian, *Le Roman social en Angleterre* (Paris, 1934), I, 82-83; F. W. Chandler, *The Literature of Roguery* (Boston, 1907), II, 370; Ford K. Brown, *Life of William Godwin* (London, 1926), 363.

<sup>4</sup> Paul Clifford, xix-xx.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, xvii.

is Thomas Campbell. Still editor of Colburn's *New Monthly Magazine* at the time *Paul Clifford* appeared, he was succeeded by Bulwer in 1831. The latter's compliment to "labours more important" may allude to the editorship and likewise to the Lord Rectorship of the University of Glasgow. Campbell ended his unprecedented third term in that office late in 1829, after performing its usually nominal duties with surprising zeal.

As for a personal connection between Bulwer and Campbell before the writing of *Paul Clifford*, Henry Colburn was publisher to both and undoubtedly brought them together. A considerable intimacy shows itself in Campbell's verses on the birth of Bulwer's first child,<sup>6</sup> in June, 1828. The two men were highly congenial, as appears from a letter which Bulwer wrote in a later year

I wish I could repeat Campbell's conversation, though I regret to say that the wittiest part of it was somewhat profane. He suggested the idea of Le Bon Dieu coming to London to sell the copyright of the Bible and going the rounds of the publishers.

Another idea full of humour he started, which though not profane was a little obscene. The peculiarity of his talk that night was riotous drollery and fun, yet such as only a man of a poet's rich imagination could invent.<sup>7</sup>

The letter as a whole convincingly presents Campbell's humor, with which the scheme of describing members of government as highwaymen in Gentleman George's public house is quite in harmony. Everything combines to suggest that it was Campbell who, on some convivial evening with Bulwer, set *Paul Clifford* going.

KEITH HOLLINGSWORTH

Wayne University

### COLERIDGE'S "METRICAL EXPERIMENTS"

Of the poems that have been printed from Coleridge's manuscript notebook and entitled "Metrical Experiments,"<sup>1</sup> O. Ritter has indentified one as actually by Thomas Parnell and another as

<sup>6</sup> "Lines to Edward Lytton Bulwer on the Birth of His Child," *New Monthly Magazine*, n s. XXIII (September, 1828), 208.

<sup>7</sup> Sadler, *op. cit.*, 186-87.

<sup>1</sup> *The Complete Poetical Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. Ernest Hartley Coleridge (Oxford, 1912), 1014-19.

by Sir John Beaumont.<sup>2</sup> I was later able to point out that number 12 of the so-called experiments is an early seventeenth-century lyric; and I therefore suggested that Coleridge's authorship of nearly all the experiments must be suspect.<sup>3</sup>

It appears probable that number 10 of these poems was borrowed for the notebook from William Cartwright's "Sadness." Cartwright's initial stanza reads.

Whiles I this standing lake,  
Swath'd up with ewe and cypress boughs,  
Do move by sighs and vows,  
Let sadness only wake;  
That whiles thick darkness blots the light,  
My thoughts may cast another night  
In which double shade,  
By heav'n, and me made,  
O let me weep,  
And fall asleep,  
And forgotten fade

Coleridge altered the last five lines in the following manner.

There in some darksome shade  
Methinks I'd weep  
Myself asleep,  
And there forgotten fade

The alterations, I believe, greatly improve the melody.

The likelihood that Coleridge turned to Cartwright for these lines is increased by Coleridge's known interest in Cartwright and by his practice of jotting in his notebooks passages from the plays and poems of the seventeenth-century author.<sup>4</sup>

EARL R. WASSERMAN

*University of Illinois*

---

<sup>2</sup> "Coleridgiana," *Englische Studien*, LVIII (1924), 377

<sup>3</sup> *MLN*, LV (1940), 432-3

<sup>4</sup> *The Complete Poetical Works*, IV; 996 n.

## A NOTE ON WORDSWORTH'S "THE SOLITARY REAPER"

Although the main source for Wordsworth's "The Solitary Reaper" is well-known, the poet may possibly have had in the back of his mind the following passage in Robert Heron's *Observations of Scotland*, a book that Wordsworth quoted from at length in a note to *The Excursion*:<sup>1</sup>

As we entered the yard at the inn of Tayndrom, we heard the plaintive and simple notes of a Gaelic air sung to Gaelic words. . . I was attracted by the music . . . For I have long since learned to admire the simple, native music of my country with all the fond enthusiasm of ignorance . . . And as I have not the happiness to understand Gaelic, it was natural for me to be pleased with the words of a Gaelic song . . . It is a fact in the history of the manners of the Highlanders, that they are accustomed to sing at the performance of almost every piece of social labour . . . Rowers in a boat sing as they ply the oars, reapers sing as they cut down handful after handful of corn, and here were washers singing as they rubbed and rinsed their clothes . . . This accompaniment of music certainly renders the labour more cheerful. .

Just how much this passage may have influenced Wordsworth cannot, of course, be positively determined. Perhaps he owes to it only the word *plaintiff* in the lines:

Will no one tell me what she sings?—  
Perhaps the plaintive numbers flow  
For old, unhappy, far-off things,  
And battles long ago

The debt may be greater, however; and Wordsworth who, like Heron, did not understand Gaelic, may have been reminded of the singing reapers he had encountered during his own tour of Scotland by reading Heron's remark that he was pleased with the words of the Gaelic song even though he did not understand it.

CHARLES NORTON COE

*University of Idaho*

---

<sup>1</sup> Wordsworth's *Poetical Works*, ed Knight, v 395-396.

<sup>2</sup> Robert Heron, *Observations made in a Journey through the Western Counties of Scotland, in the Autumn of M, DCC, XCII* . . . 1793, i 286



## REVIEWS

---

*Shakspeare's Five-Act Structure.* By T. W. BALDWIN. Urbana the University of Illinois Press, 1947. Pp. xviii + 848. \$20.00.

The present volume in Professor Baldwin's series of Shakspeare studies is a major contribution toward the solution of one of the most difficult and controversial problems in Shakspearean exegesis that of act-division in the plays. The problem has two principal aspects composition and stage-presentation. The author is not here concerned to discuss the matter of act-division in the contemporary productions of Shakspeare's plays but rather to answer the question. Did Shakspeare compose the earliest plays he designed for the Elizabethan stage with a definite act-structure in mind? Professor Baldwin's answer is a solid and emphatic yes.

The author's procedure is to examine first the doctrines concerning act-structure that were taught or talked about from earliest recorded times. He finds the theory of five-act structure first discussed at length in the commentary of Donatus upon Terence. After a preliminary consideration of the discernible act-structure in the surviving plays of Terence, he proceeds to describe and carefully analyze the theories of five-act structure set forth in the commentaries upon ancient drama and taught in the schools of Europe from the time of Donatus and Servius to that of the schoolboy William Shakspeare. No significant commentary upon this matter, one judges, has been overlooked. It must be a long time since anyone has taken extended notice of such worthies as Raphael Regrus, Calphurnius, Benedictus Philologus, Guido Juvenalis, Omphalius, Latomus, and Iodocus Willichius; but here they receive full justice—and a great many more besides—as we follow their efforts to explain the structure of Terence, chiefly, to their schoolboy classes. The investigation provides an impressive model of the method to be used if we are ever to have a fully informed opinion concerning the theoretical processes brought to bear upon the production of literature in the Renaissance—as Professor Baldwin insists, the present study traces but a single strand in the skein of theory that lies behind the development of one literary genre; at least, this particular thread—or perhaps one should say 'cable'—will not have to be disentangled again.

The outcome of Professor Baldwin's preliminary investigation may be thus summarized. The formula of five-act structure that came to be generally accepted as derived from ancient authority and universally taught in the schools of Europe from the mid-sixteenth century onwards requires the first two acts of the play to set forth

the situation, the dramatic struggle (the *protasis*), the third act brings the struggle to a crisis (*epitasis*) which is continued to its height in the fourth act (called by J. C. Scaliger the *catastasis*); the fifth act contains the solution (*catastrophe*).

Professor Baldwin then demonstrates that this formula was known in England during the sixteenth century and commonly taught in the grammar schools as part of the prescribed study of Terence. Thus William Shakspeare probably gained an early familiarity with it as a 'learned grammarian' at Stratford, and in any event could hardly have avoided some acquaintance with its employment in English plays that use this structure, like *Roister Doister*, *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, various performances at the Inns of Court and the universities, and especially the plays of John Lyly, who was, Professor Baldwin holds, among Shakspeare's contemporaries his first model in the art of writing comedy.

The last third of the volume contains the most interesting and controversial part of Professor Baldwin's study. Professor Baldwin uses the evidence of act-structure, supplemented by whatever other evidences are available, in an attempt to establish exactly the chronology of Shakspeare's earliest plays. He concludes that Shakspeare began his career as a dramatist with *Love's Labour's Lost*, which was "constructed in 1588-9, and was augmented as its title page claims for the revival of 1598" (p. 664), that *The Comedy of Errors* followed in 1589 (p. 690), with a version of *All's Well* probably intermediate between them (p. 734), that *Two Gentlemen* preceded *Romeo and Juliet*, which latter, in its earliest form, should be assigned to the summer of 1591 (p. 775), and that "it is finally clear that Shakspeare began upon comedy, not tragedy, and that he first wrote independent plays, only later revised some that others had written" (p. 805). These conclusions, based as they are upon an exhaustive analysis of the available evidence, are the foundation for a study of the chronological development of Shakspeare's art to be continued in subsequent volumes.

Professor Baldwin establishes beyond reasonable doubt that Shakspeare knew and used a five-act structure in writing these early plays. That the available evidence warrants his dating these plays so precisely in order of composition is more debatable. He makes a strong case for the primacy of *Love's Labour's Lost* in 1588-9 from a variety of contemporary allusions which support his argument that the structure of the play is imitated from the versions of Lyly's *Endimion* and *Gallathea* acted in 1587-8 (pp. 628-9); but *Romeo and Juliet* is assigned to 1591 chiefly on the basis of the resemblance between 'Gallop apace, ye fiery-footed steeds/ Towards Phoebus' lodging' and the prayer of Marlowe's Edward II: 'Gallop a pace bright Phoebus through the skie.' Shakspeare's lines are held to derive from Brooke and Ovid; Marlowe, however, derived from Shakspeare, and Marlowe's further conjectured borrowing from the printed *Troublesome Reign of King John* (1591) is taken to square

with the Nurse's 'Tis since the earthquake now eleven years' to establish indubitably the summer of 1591 for the first version of *Romeo and Juliet*. One wonders whether this evidence is strong enough to bear the weight of Professor Baldwin's insistence. Nevertheless, it is extremely important to establish as definitely as we can the chronology of the plays. Professor Baldwin doubtless feels that guarded and qualified surmises, though safer, are of no real help in this difficult matter. His very insistence will stimulate closer study of the plays, and his conclusions will not be easily set aside.

It is further argued that Shakspeare's earliest plays employ the expository purpose of Terentian comedy, where the interest is more in the dramatic working out of an idea than in the narrative, and that Shakspeare's development, like that of his fellow dramatists, illustrates the growth of the narrative interest in English drama at the expense of the expository. Despite Professor Baldwin's ingenious argument for the importance of the idea that "we conquer our affections not by study but by grace" in *Love's Labour's Lost* (p. 616), it is not clear to this reviewer how the expository and narrative purposes can be profitably separated even in this play, and it is not easy to see how the distinction may be maintained in discussing later plays like *Lear* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, where the two purposes seem to be inextricably joined. Shakspeare's skill in plotting and characterization unquestionably improved as he went on, but this is not to say that his interest in working out ideas in his plays correspondingly diminished, or even that the interest in ideas is uppermost in his earliest plays.

One hopes that Professor Baldwin will consider the matter of stage presentation in his following studies of the structure of Shakspeare's plays. It seems most probable that some, at least, of the plays performed in the public theatres of Shakspeare's time did not observe four act-pauses in production. If some of Shakspeare's plays were performed with fewer than four act-pauses, it would be surprising to find that this circumstance did not lead Shakspeare to modify the five-act formula in the composition of his plays, since no dramatist of the period shows greater attention to the effects to be produced in the theatre.

H. S. WILSON

University of Toronto

*Elizabethan Poetry in the Eighteenth Century.* By EARL R. WASSERMAN. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1947. Pp. 291. \$2.50. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature Vol. XXXII, nos. 2-3.)

*Les Poètes Anglais du XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle.* By LÉON LEMONNIER. Paris: Boivin & C<sup>ie</sup>, 1947. Pp. 245. (Le Livre de l'Étudiant, no. 20.)

The eighteenth century's awareness of "Elizabethan" poetry

will bear careful exploration, and Dr. Wasserman has given a painstaking and worthwhile account of the subject, revealing much that is not apparent on the surface. In his second chapter, for example, he demonstrates by means of collation and illustration with what surprising thoroughness the earlier poets were "corrected" in eighteenth-century editions. Indeed, he makes it evident that editorial "accuracy," during at least the first three quarters of the century, included "improvement" as essential business: regulation of meter, modernizing and dignifying of language, smoothing and correction of syntax and grammar.

In a chapter on Shakespeare and Spenser, attention is briefly given to the slight influence of Shakespeare's style on the non-dramatic poetry—the Drama is omitted by design—but sixty pages are justifiably given over to tracing the impact of Spenser's fancy, his moral, his metric, and his diction. Although the tale is hardly new, there is probably nowhere a more useful summary than this of a fascinating episode in the annals of changing literary taste, and Wasserman has increased its value by appending a quite extensive chronological list of poems influenced by Spenser. In view of the pervasive indifference of our own eclectic age (apart from the small band of the devoted), it is very remarkable how the eighteenth century ran the gamut of all responses save indifference to that unique voice: they laughed, they shuddered, they were vexed, they were edified, they admired, they loved, they were transported; they travestied, they imitated affectionately or reverently, they borrowed elements of his art at will, but they could never leave him alone. They were bewitched with his company, but the medicines he gave them in time set them free.

The Elizabethan Lyric is a less manageable subject, and the chapter devoted to it is subject to objection and correction. Although reference is made to many song-books and to musical performance, little justice is done to this sister art, nor does Wasserman always heed the implications of his own statements. For example, he fails to take proper account of new musical settings as agents of survival or revival of earlier lyrics, but prefers the dubious course of positing an "increasing enthusiasm for Elizabethan music" (p. 169) which "led to an interest in the lyrics themselves," which thereupon gave an impulse to new settings. Now, quantities of new settings would seem patently to deny enthusiasm for the old, and in any case such enthusiasm would be hard to document at that date. It is true that Hawkins paid attention to the earlier English music in his *History* (1776), but mainly as to a curiosity; and Dr. Burney, writing in the same decade, notices the Elizabethans for the most part only to decry them. Minute scholars, besides, will note a good many inaccuracies and doubtful assertions in this part of the work.\*

\* The unsupported statement seems churlish, but details are space-con-

The tenor of this chapter on the Lyric is hostile—or at the very least patronizing—to the eighteenth century. Although commencing with salutary caution by acknowledging the persistence of a taste for older lyric, Wasserman seems not to have absorbed the significance of his evidence. He writes as if from the point of view of a nineteenth-century critic with a stereotyped, unfavorable idea of the eighteenth century, who then, being frequently confronted with evidence contradictory to the stereotype, remains unable or unwilling to make a radical revision of judgment commensurate with the facts. The attitude is epitomized in the following sentence

Incongruous though the picture may be, it is not at all unlikely that Pope occasionally sat through performances of Heywood's "You pretty birds that sit and sing" or Bie-ton's "In the merry month of May" and that perhaps Horace Walpole, taking a turn through Vauxhall, stopped to hear Mr Lowe sing Wither's "Shall I wasting in despair," set to music by Dr. Aine" (p 159)

The incongruity, of course, resides not in the historical facts, but in their failure to correspond with a too narrow and constricted idea of the age, in the mind of the observer. And, here, the critic seems inflexibly to proceed with the contradiction unresolved and persistent. Wasserman rightly points out that most of the earlier lyrics in the *Reliques* had been popular in the first half of Percy's century, but when he discusses the neoclassical attitude toward Lyric, his account is unleavened by this knowledge. Quoting as "characteristic of his age" Ambrose Philips's prescription for song, Wasserman says: "We need only try to fit to this formula a poem of so massive a theme as Shirley's 'The glories of our birth [*sic*] and state' to discover how greatly the concept of the lyric had changed" (p. 171). Yes—but maugre the formula the century admired Shirley's "fine moral stanzas," as Percy called them when he came to reprint them; and such facts tend to be obliterated by the negative drift of Wasserman's discussion:

But . . . their theory of the genre was at variance with Elizabethan practice. A desire for regularity, moderated witiness, conventionalized feelings, and brilliant polish had replaced the emotionalism, subjectivity, and lyrical variety of the Elizabethan songs . . . To accuse these men of a literary blindness, however, would be beside the point. [Ariel's song, "Full fathoms five,"] lacks "an elegant and unaffected turn of wit" and "utmost nicety," and therefore the neoclassicists could not perceive any

---

suming. An instance or two must stand for all. It appears to be consistently assumed that Byrd, Wilbye, Robert Jones, Ravenscroft, Orlando Gibbons, and the rest, wrote the lyrics they set (cf pp 154, 157, 158, 159, 169, and Index, s. v. Byrd, Gibbon [*sic*]). Is there any good authority for attributing "Walsingham" to Raleigh? or the familiar setting of "Drink to me only" to Thomas Linley? When Marlowe's "Come live with me" was taken into Bickerstaffe's *Love in a Village* (1762, not 1777)—but I do not find it there—the caption, "A favourite Scotch Air" presumably refers to the tune, not to the words (p 167)

virtue in it. It is not surprising that one of the most popular songs in the eighteenth century was William Whitehead's "Je Ne Scai Quoi" [Pp. 171-73]

When they altered and reworked, the neoclassicists, says the critic, fitted "characteristic neoclassic clichés to the highly lyrical pattern" (p. 183) or put out, as original, a "juggling" of earlier beauties, in which "only the versification and the general sense are preserved, but [in which] *much of the charm, vigor, and delicacy of the original persists in shining through* [italics mine]. The most vicious instance of this eighteenth-century form of literary deception" &c. "The Augustans generally borrowed from the Elizabethans their themes, a witty thought, an ingenious figure of speech, but rarely their artistry" (p. 184). Donne's pieces, for example, were reduced to "a greatly simplified, almost mechanical versification, which the Augustans characterized as 'smooth.'" The ensuing pages ring the changes on these denigrations "neoclassic poeticisms," "enervated," "only the intellectual playfulness that the neoclassicists delighted in," "leveled out," "little taste for the daintiness of the fairy lore" (although, he has just remarked, "the Augustan put the lyric into the same category as the exquisite *objets d'art* which was one of his supreme contributions"), "genteel evenness," "complete artificiality." There is little apparent effort to admit the existence of values other than what are taken, without argument or definition, to be the Elizabethan absolute, or to descry any characteristic excellences in Georgian lyric. Yet surely Wasserman, when put to the question, is ready to allow that it does not follow that the early Georgians, because "their theory of the genre was at variance with Elizabethan practice," were therefore lacking all sense of a style they chose not to practise; any more than that our own age may fairly be accused of insensitivity to Elizabethan Lyric because our poets do not try the same tune. Moreover, is there in fact no singing quality in the witty lyric, in the age of the ballad opera, or of the hymns of Addison, Watts, Charles Wesley, Cowper?

The book, in fact, has an air of critical confusion, and its major terms are abused by the looseness with which they are employed. *Augustan* and *neoclassical* are used interchangeably, and cover the whole century and more, while *Elizabethan* with equal freedom covers any poet from Cornish and Skelton to Herrick. Finer discriminations of style within these categories are for the most part lacking. Can it properly be cited as evidence of Elizabethan "revival" that Herrick (pb. 1647-48) appears with settings by the Laweses in Playford's songbooks of dates 1652 to 1673? And if the "neoclassical" treatment of earlier texts is already manifest in Edward Phillips's *Drummond*, 1656, are we not to take account of an aesthetic and intellectual thrust of more moment than a tasteless aberration of the next century?

In truth, "neoclassicism," if defined at all, is defined here largely by negatives. The first chapter, on "Neoclassic Criticism," helps less than one would hope, although it reaches the striking and valuable truth that "The revolt against some of the narrower restrictions of neoclassicism begins with neoclassicism itself." The final chapter, on "The Elizabethan 'Revival,'" is a useful synopsis of that trend of scholarly and critical interest and taste, particularly as it affected the editors and historians. It would, moreover, be ungrateful not to acknowledge and praise the faithful and close study that has gone into the work as a whole, whilst yet maintaining that the picture falls short of consistency in attitude, and is critically incommensurate with its subject.

Far from the atmosphere of a dissertation is Léon Lemonnier's little book, one of those introductory sketches of which the French possess the special secret. M. Lemonnier, in a dozen short chapters, has outlined the life and achievement of an equal number of poets of the eighteenth century, from Pope to Blake. This is no book for the specialist, nor does it appear that the author has kept abreast of the literature of his subject. He does not take advantage of recent studies of Burns and Blake, and his brief bibliography is by no means up to date. But, if there is little here that is new all is freshly and sensitively perceived, and expressed with a limpid ease and grace, a delicate precision, a transparent clarity, a perfect accord of matter and manner, which scholarship on this side the Atlantic can only admire and envy.

BERTRAND H. BRONSON

*University of California, Berkeley*

*Quest for Mysteries. The Masonic Background for Literature in Eighteenth-Century Germany.* By HEINRICH SCHNEIDER: Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1947. Pp. ix + 178.

Before reading the book, I, too, was inclined "to brand all secret societies of mystical character not fitting into the Enlightenment pattern—and such were met with often—as aberrations, perversions, or downright impostures, and to dispose of them as unworthy of serious consideration" (8f.). Having read Schneider's book, I have become aware of the fact that my ideas were to a large extent based on oversimplifications; by the mass of evidence presented Schneider proves conclusively that masonry can not be explained as a mere offshoot of rationalism. If the reader wonders why his ideas on masonry were so completely mistaken, he finds the answer to that question in chapter ix (Some Results of Research) where Schneider, discussing previous research on the subject, comes to the conclusion that many leading authorities in the field of German Literature,

scholars such as Hettner, Richard Meyer, F. J. Schneider, held inadequate, if not erroneous ideas on the secret societies of the eighteenth century.

Schneider's book bears the subtitle: *The Masonic Background for Literature in the Eighteenth Century*. This subtitle is somewhat misleading since Schneider does not discuss the literary significance of masonry at all; his real aim is to detect in the cultural life of the eighteenth century the intellectual and religious needs that the secret societies tried to meet. The most important cause of their rise Schneider finds in that "failure of Protestantism to create a genuine new religious communion" (35). Viewed in this light, masonry appears as a movement paralleling pietism, and indeed, the kinship of the two movements is strongly emphasized by the author (47-49). He admits, to be sure, that the ideological aim of masonry "as it made its first appearance in Germany" is closely related to that of rationalism, and he describes masonry as "the practical realization of the idea of humanity whose truth and value enlightened thought accepted as apodictic" (56), but "even if the fundamental idea was rationally established, the mason . . . never ceased to be aware that the consummation of his quest, being a state of mind and an attitude, was and must remain an ineffable mystery" (56 f.). According to Schneider the cult of the secret societies was to a considerable degree motivated by what he calls a "mystical reaction . . . against the claims of reason" (67).

The reader is informed in the preface that only a sketch of the basic principles of the secret societies was attempted, not a complete history (VIII). There is no doubt that this book is considerably more than a mere sketch; but it is true that many questions which might interest the literary historian in particular are left unanswered. The relationship of masonic ideas to the leading systems of Enlightenment philosophy—to Thomasius, Rüdiger, Wolff, Crusius, Mendelssohn—is touched on rather than discussed; the problem of possible connections between the eighteenth century cult of mysteries and that of ancient Greece is not included although they are bound to exist as Morhof's *Polyhistor*, Wieland's *Agathon* and other works indicate. All scholars of eighteenth century literature would be deeply grateful to Schneider if he were to follow up his book by a more complete work on the secret societies.

The translation of the book which was originally written in German is occasionally too literal.

HANS M. WOLFF

University of California, Berkeley



*La Geste du Prince Igor' Épopée russe du douzième siècle.* Texte établi, traduit et commenté sous la direction d' HENRI GRÉGOIRE, de ROMAN JAKOBSON et de MARC SZEFTTEL, assistés de J. A. JOFFE. *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves* Ecole Libre des Hautes Etudes à New York. Université Libre de Bruxelles. Tome VIII (1945-1947). New York, 1948. Pp. 383.

This edition of the most important medieval Russian epic is the collective work of a group of Slavic scholars accomplished in New York during the recent war. The main burden of the work fell on Roman Jakobson's shoulders. He has made a critical edition of the poem, supplied an elaborate *apparatus*, attempted a complete reconstruction of the text in the Russian of the twelfth century (as the manuscript dates only from the sixteenth century), made a new accurate translation into modern Russian and finally has written a long treatise (pp. 235-360) defending the authenticity of the *Lay of Igor*. Jakobson demonstrates beyond the possibility of doubt that André Mazon's bold attempt (*Le Slovo d' Igor*, Paris, 1940), to prove the poem a forgery of the late eighteenth century is totally mistaken. One after another of Mazon's arguments is taken up and shown to be invalid: all the supposed "obscurities" are cleared up, the orientalisms are proved ancient and genuine. There are no polonisms, gallicisms, nor, of course, epithets in the style of American Indians as M. Mazon had argued. There is no similarity between the case of *Igor* and the famous forgeries of old Czech manuscripts by Hanka and his associates. There is nothing to Mazon's view that the text contains modernisms, morphological and syntactical mistakes, pseudo-classical conventions and even Ossianic evocations and landscapes. The *Lay* is shown to have definite links with Byzantine chronicles and eschatological prophecies. Jakobson demonstrates its influence on Russian literature of the later Middle Ages. The poem *Zadonshchina*, which undoubtedly dates from the fifteenth century, cannot have been the model for the forger, as M. Mazon argued, but clearly was dependent on the *Lay of Igor*. Finally the author of the *Lay* had such a remarkable knowledge of folklore, magic formulas and pagan mythology that it is quite inconceivable that anybody in the eighteenth century could have had access to these facts. The arguments are marshalled so convincingly that the sensational thesis of the French scholar can be dismissed quite safely. Jakobson's conclusions are further supported by an essay of George Vernadsky's which shows how well the historical allusions of the *Lay* accord with our present-day knowledge; and obviously there is none more competent to judge than the author of *Ancient Russia*. Marc Szeftel, besides, has provided a detailed historical commentary to every name in the

poem and with great learning has cleared up many obscurities and disengaged many implications

The edition contains, besides, a spirited French translation by Henri Grégoire, the Belgian byzantologist, a Polish translation by the poet Julian Tuwim and finally a fluent and accurate English translation by the late Samuel H. Cross of Harvard University. It seems a pity that Mr. Cross's translation still has some traces of Ossianic diction and rhythms which seem to contradict the arguments of the editor, though they must be explained by common Biblical antecedents.

A new volume of studies which will examine the poetic art of the poem in detail and contain further studies of its relation to the Russian poetic tradition as well as of its Oriental, Scandinavian and Classical elements is promised for the near future. In comparison with all the many Russian editions, Jakobson's constitutes a new definite advance in the elucidation of problems of the text and of interpretation. It also illuminates the most important poem of ancient Russia in its historical relations and definitely, even crushingly, refutes the doubts about its authenticity raised by M. Mazon.

RENÉ WELLIK

*Yale University*

*Boccalmi in Spain. A Study of His Influences on Prose Fiction of the Seventeenth Century.* By ROBERT H. WILLIAMS Menasha, Wisconsin: 1947. Pp. viii + 139.

La influencia de Boccalmi en España se había estudiado solamente en relación con algun gran escritor—Gracián, por ejemplo—, pero carecíamos de una exposición de conjunto como las existentes acerca de la misma influencia en otras literaturas europeas. Este es el hueco que viene a llenar ahora el cuidadoso trabajo del Prof. Williams.

Después de exponer brevemente la vida y las obras de Boccalmi (I), el autor examina con detención las traducciones españolas (II), así las impresas como las manuscritas, sin omitir las que tienen un carácter fragmentario. La traducción de los *Ragguagli* de Pérez de Sousa está descrita minuciosamente. En el apéndice del libro hay una tabla de correspondencias entre las divisiones del texto italiano, siguiendo la edición de G. Rua, y la traducción de Pérez de Sousa en sus diferentes ediciones, que permite establecer exactamente las alteraciones y supresiones realizadas. Parece extraño que habiendo utilizado varios manuscritos del British Museum, el autor no se refiera para nada al que cita Gayangos en su catálogo (vol. I, p. 123) con el curioso título de *El sistema de la paz perpetua y las niñas de Tolosa*, aunque se trate probablemente de alguna adap-

tación libre. A las imitaciones y adaptaciones dedica el Prof. Williams el tercero y más extenso capítulo de su obra (p. 28-29). El circunstanciado examen de la producción de más de veinte escritores, grandes e ínfimos, desde Cervantes hasta Francisco Santos, atestigua la popularidad de Boccalini en España y la persistencia de su influjo a lo largo del siglo XVII. Pero el autor no se ha limitado a este período, y añade, aunque de manera menos sistemática, varias muestras de la influencia boccaliniana en el siglo siguiente. En capítulo aparte (IV) recoge alusiones y referencias diversas al escritor italiano, desde Suárez de Figueroa y Lope de Vega hasta don Ramón de la Cruz. En una sumaria recapitulación final (V), el Prof. Williams trata de explicar la singular aceptación entre los españoles de un escritor hostil a España, como Boccalini, por el ambiente de desilusión propicio al cultivo de la sátira. Hubiera valido la pena detenerse algo más en la cuestión. El autor señala luego las partes de la obra boccaliniana más frecuentemente imitadas, pero refiriéndose más bien a las alegorías o procedimientos satíricos que a las ideas que allí se contienen. Si el ingenio de Boccalini pudo ser el principal motivo de atracción para sus lectores españoles, en él había asimismo un pensamiento político que no debió ser indiferente para los observadores "desengañados" de su propio país.

El autor cree ver algo más que simple coincidencia entre la silva de Quevedo "Al inventor de la pieza de artillería"—donde, exaltando al fuego como instrumento divino y elemento natural de vida, se combate principalmente la soberbia humana—y el *ragguaglio* 46 de la primera centuria del libro de Boccalini—expresión de su ideal pacifista, contra la ambición guerrera de los príncipes—; pero en la concepción y desarrollo del tema el español y el italiano siguen caminos tan diversos que apenas queda otra semejanza que la execración del mortífero invento, verdadero lugar común en la literatura de la época.

V. LLORENS

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*The Palmerin Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction.* By MARY PATCHELL. New York, Columbia University Press, 1947. Pp. xiii + 157. \$2.50. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, No. 166.)

That familiar bit of arrogant ignorance, peculiar to Anglo-American "scholarship," which inclines to dismiss Spanish literature as of no consequence will not be cured by Professor Patchell's book. But it will be rebuked. *The Palmerin Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction* is, in fact, a long overdue and highly commendable specimen of the type of comparative study needed to

supplement the excellent but inexhaustive survey made half a century ago by J. G. Underhill in his *Spanish Literature in the England of the Tudors*. If Professor Patchell's book acts as a precipitant to further works of the sort, as is to be hoped, it will have served a very useful purpose.

The author has not been misled into a false estimate of the literary value of her materials. As she puts it in the Introduction (p. xii), "the intrinsic merit of these works is so slight that they deserve the oblivion into which they have fallen, yet to the historian of literature they are an interesting and significant reflection of the literary taste of a large group of readers of the sixteenth century and the source of a flood of chivalric imitations which made a characteristic contribution to the stream of English fiction." It is, then, really as a contribution to the history of taste that the five chapters of her study undertake "to describe these romances in their English dress, to analyze their themes and motifs, to note wherein they have followed and wherein they have departed from inherited literary tradition, and to point out what they have taken from contemporary Renaissance modes and what they have contributed to English fiction" (p. xiii).

Naturally, in treating comparatively material unfamiliar, if not inaccessible, to her readers the author has been forced to present a great deal of analytical detail not immediately relevant to her main concern—the influence of the *Palmerin* romances in England. Most readers will therefore probably feel that the principal contribution of the book is made in the more generalized discussions of the first and the last chapters. Nevertheless, the three central chapters—"Narrative Motifs," "The Treatment of Love," and "Literary Technique"—taken together with Appendix I, "Summaries of the *Palmerin* Romances," provide for the non-specialist reader an adequate notion of a typical group of Spanish *libros de caballería* and help him, thus, to read his translated *Don Quixote* a little more intelligently. It is perhaps proper to observe here that, since the "Elizabethan" of the title is accorded the customary extension, the *Palmerin* connections of the Shelton-Cervantes *Don Quixote* might justifiably have been given more than incidental attention.

Throughout the book there is scattered a considerable amount of criticism of Anthony Munday, chief English translator of the series. One of the most interesting points in this connection is that (p. 91) which calls attention to his euphuistic additions to the English translations. An appendix (Appendix II, pp. 134-135) also reprints three lyrics interpolated by Munday in his translation of *Primaleon*. In the final chapter, "The Influence of the Spanish Romances on Elizabethan Prose Fiction," Professor Patchell makes out a fairly convincing case for the influence of the *Palmerin* series, as well as the Amadis, upon Sidney's *Arcadia*. But the reader would have more confidence in the substantial "influence" of the *Palmerin* romances upon general Elizabethan fiction if the author had been

able to base her conclusions upon more than the "dozen or more of the late English romances" (p. 96) read, and if she had adduced—as it was assuredly possible to do—a greater number of contemporary allusions to the series.

JOHN LEON LIEVSAY

University of Tennessee

*The Percy Letters*, DAVID NICHOL SMITH & CLEANTH BROOKS, General Editors. *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy & Richard Farmer*. Edited by CLEANTH BROOKS. Baton Rouge Louisiana State University Press, 1946. Pp. xviii + 218. \$3.50.

"Steevens is [a] young Man of very good estate, who has the greatest Zeal for the advancement of Literature that I ever knew; and spares no pains or cost to assist every laudable Pursuit."

This characterization of the young Shakespearean scholar, George Steevens, is an illustration not only of Thomas Percy's wide familiarity with the literary world of his day but also his appreciation for true scholarship. It is a fair sample of the many delightful glimpses which these letters give of men and books in the mid-eighteenth century. There is Johnson, of course: "I have for some time past had Mr. Johnson and his friend Mrs. Williams at my house: they have not yet left me, tho they *begin to talk of it*." (The italics are Percy's, the visit lasted nearly two months). Then there are the Shakespearians—Farmer and Capel and Steevens and Garrick; the Chaucerian, Tyrwhitt; and the romantics of various types—Gray, Walpole, the Wartons, Bishop Hurd, and William Shenstone.

Primarily, however, this series of letters is concerned with Percy's efforts in collecting and editing materials for the *Reliques*. He turned to his friend Farmer constantly for advice and aid. The correspondence reveals a surprising depth of scholarship and respect for thorough research at that date. This is emphasized by Professor Brooks in his Introduction as well as in his most careful and thorough notes. Not all questions are solved, and only one minor misinterpretation seems to have crept in: Gray, the poet, and "Mr. Gray" (p. 145, n. 3) were two different persons, the latter was attached in some way to the Northumberland household. But to one who has almost lived with Percy materials for twenty-five years, the extent and accuracy of information supplied by the editor is a source of constant enjoyment.

There are fifty-five letters in the volume, covering the period of 1762-1778. The Introduction treats informatively the Percy-

Farmer relationship, and the Appendix is a careful study of about all that is known of Percy's ill-fated edition of Surrey.

This volume is the second in the series of eight or ten projected for the Percy Letters under the editorship of David Nichol Smith and Cleanth Brooks. The Percy-Malone Correspondence was published earlier. The next volume will give the Percy-Warton letters. That such an extensive series of documents is now to be available in print is good fortune for students of the eighteenth century.

VINCENT H. OGBURN

*Eastern New Mexico College*

---

*The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth Evening Voluntaries . . . Ode Intimations of Immortality* Edited from the manuscripts with textual and critical notes by E. DE SELINCOURT and HELEN DARBISHIRE. Oxford Clarendon Press [New York. Oxford University Press], 1947. Pp. xvi + 490. \$7.50.

Although neither title or half-title mention the fact, this is the fourth volume of the new edition of Wordsworth which is distinguished by giving readings from hitherto unused manuscripts. The contributions of these manuscripts to the present volume are principally (1) making a separate line of "But He" in the Immortality Ode and thus providing a rime for line 66; printing for the first time (2) the translation of most of the first three books and some fifty other lines of *The Aeneid* together with (3) the modernization of Chaucer's *Manciple's Tale*. These and the new short pieces, as well as those previously published, but not by their author, are productions that the world would willingly let die. Several of them, it should be noticed, are satires. The pedestrian translation of Virgil is interesting chiefly because its couplets are varied with the triplets and alexandrines used by Dryden. Why from all Chaucer's riches Wordsworth chose *The Manciple's Tale* it is hard to see, but his reason for not printing his modernizing of it was that his friends thought it indelicate. He did not—his sister had read *The Miller's Tale* to him.

"To my knowledge," writes Karl Shapiro,<sup>1</sup> "I have never seen a discarded poem that excelled the final form." This is not to say that discarded words or phrases may not be better than those finally chosen, but in Wordsworth's case revisions are usually improvements. The many changes made in the "Ode to Duty" illustrate this fact strikingly. The rejected readings, although at times

<sup>1</sup> *Poets at Work*, New York, 1948, 121.

illuminating, are wordy and unduly detailed, and thus dissipate the terse, direct vigor which is essential to so stern an ode. Even the stanza which is here restored "as a valuable link in the thought" weakens the poem. The editors point out the ode's significantly heavy debt to Milton.

The bulk of the notes are those Wordsworth published and those he dictated to Miss Fenwick. The latter, often trivial and seldom dealing with esthetic problems, represent in the main a lost opportunity; Wordsworth might have given us something like the prefaces of Henry James. No mention is made of the publication by B. Ifor Evans in the *TLS* for June 13, 1936,<sup>2</sup> of the rejected stanzas, here given, of "Fidelity" and the "Ode to Duty", nor are we told that the "Mr. Alstone" of Wordsworth's note (p. 397) is the American painter Washington Allston, Coleridge's friend and Wordsworth's acquaintance, and that his "exquisite picture of 'Jacob's Dream'" is said to be at Petworth.

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

---

*English Literary Criticism The Renaissance.* By J W. H. ATKINS. London: Methuen, 1948. Pp xi + 371. 16s. In his previous volumes Atkins has surveyed the literary theories of ancient and mediaeval times; in this one he narrows his study to English criticism between 1500 and the death of Milton. His general procedure is chronological and he summarizes each critical work as it comes up in time. The result, of course, is not highly successful for one would rather read the critical treatises of Ascham, Sidney, or Puttenham than Atkins' fairly lengthy résumés; however, one must notice that these digests are sometimes made illuminating by observations drawn from Atkins' earlier volumes. It seems to me that the author is at his best when he is forced to gather a critic's opinions from a variety of places rather than from a single work; his pages on Jonson are consequently better than those on Webbe. It is unfortunate that Atkins did not follow this method throughout, because it might have resulted in a better and shorter book. One is also surprised by Atkins' faithful avoidance of the many works of scholarship on Renaissance theories of rhetoric and criticism that have appeared during the last fifteen years, but one can assume that the journals and special studies that Americans read are simply not to be had in Wales.

D. C. A.

---

<sup>2</sup> The reference to this article in another connection (p. 465) gives the date as 1938.

# Modern Language Notes

---

---

Volume LXIII

DECEMBER, 1948

Number 8

---

---

## THE ALLEGED FIRST FOREIGN ESTIMATE OF SHAKESPEARE

According to the late Ambassador Jusserand, Nicolas Clément was the first Frenchman to express an opinion about Shakespeare. He made this statement because a librarian at the Bibliothèque Nationale had reported to him that a slip forming part of a catalogue made by Clément between 1675 and 1684 read as follows:

Will Shakespeare

*Poeta anglicus*

Opera poetica, continentia tragoedias, comedies et historiolas Angl<sup>ie</sup>,  
Lond Th Cotes, 1632, f<sup>o</sup>

Eaedem Tragœdiæ et comedîæ anglicæ Lond W Leake, 1641, 4<sup>o</sup>.

Ce poete anglois a l'ymagination assés belle, jl pense naturellement, jl s'exprime avec finesse, mais ces belles qualitez sont obscurcies par les ordures qu'il mêle dans ses Comédies.

Jusserand published his find in the *Revue critique d'histoire et de littérature* for Nov. 14, 1887, adding that he owed "à l'obligeance de M. Barringer d'avoir pu prendre connaissance de la page relative à Shakespeare." This does not mean that he actually saw the slip. Barringer may have copied it for him. But in *Shakespeare in France under the Ancien Régime*<sup>1</sup> he referred to the "original slip which I discovered some years ago," implying that he had seen it himself.

Other scholars have accepted his belief that the comment expressed Clément's personal opinion of Shakespeare. Ascoli quoted his statement in his *Grande Bretagne devant l'opinion publique française au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*.<sup>2</sup> M. Bonno followed Ascoli in his recent

<sup>1</sup> London, Unwin, 1899, p 170.

<sup>2</sup> Paris, Gamber, 1930, II, 150 Ascoli changed "dans ses Comédies" to



work, *La culture et la civilisation britanniques devant l'opinion française de la paix d'Utrecht aux Lettres philosophiques, 1713-1734*.<sup>4</sup> M. Van Tieghem reproduced the Jusserand statement in his *Piétromantisme, la Découverte de Shakespeare sur le continent*,<sup>4</sup> though he expressed surprise that an opinion of this sort should have been written at so early a date. Neither he nor the others asked whether Jusserand had actually seen the slip, whether the comment is in the same hand as the earlier portion of the entry.

Last summer I asked Dr. L. O. Forkey to examine the slip. After he had done so, he informed me that the first part of the entry is written in a formal hand, almost as if the letters had been engraved, but that the comment is in a flowing hand and written with darker ink. His impression was confirmed by that of the librarian whom he consulted. It is consequently obvious that Clément did not write the comment and that it may have been added to the slip at a much later date.

That it was so added is shown by the fact that it is found in the *Mercure de France* for June, 1727:<sup>5</sup>

Cet Auteur, dit M Collier en sa Critique du Théâtre Anglois, a l'imagination assez belle, il pense naturellement, il s'exprime avec finesse, mais ces belles qualitez sont obscurcies par les ordures qu'il mêle dans ses Comedies.

As no two men could compose independently identical comments of this length, one must be a copy of the other. Apparently one of Nicolas Clément's successors copied on the slip, in 1727 or subsequently, the comment he had read in the popular magazine. This is certainly a far more reasonable conclusion than to suppose that a writer for the *Mercure* thought of examining a slip at the Bibliothèque du Roi, or that, if the comment were already there, he should be allowed to have access to it. Jusserand's discovery is consequently of no importance in dating knowledge of Shakespeare on the continent, for before 1727 there had been other observations that show greater familiarity with the dramatist.<sup>6</sup>

"à ses tragédies" J. G. Robertson (*MLR*, 1 (1905), 312) accepted as genuine Jusserand's discovery, as did C. M. Haines, *Shakespeare in France*, London, 1925, p. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Published in the *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. XXXVIII, Part I. He quotes from Ascoli on p. 53.

<sup>5</sup> Paris, Sfelt, 1947, pp. 4, 5.

<sup>6</sup> P. 1449.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Van Tieghem, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-6, and Bonno, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-8.

Now is it true that the comment comes from Collier? When I read the article, I expected to find the original of the comment either in Collier's *Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage*, or in the French translation of 1715.<sup>7</sup> But such is not the case. Collier and his translator make several disparaging references to Shakespeare, but their texts resemble that of the *Mercure* only in a reference to the poet's obscenity:<sup>8</sup>

Ce qu'il merite du côté de l'esprit, il le perd du côté de la conduite; & suivant la fortune de Plaute, par tout où il est plus obscene, il est ordinairement moins sensé

Moreover, Professor Bonno has shown<sup>9</sup> that the article in the *Mercure* is largely a textual reproduction of pages from a *Dissertation sur la Poesie Angloise* that appeared at The Hague in 1717, forming part of the *Journal littéraire*.<sup>10</sup> The comment in question, though absent from this production as well as from Collier, could easily have been composed, if the writer combined the latter's emphasis upon indecency with an estimate like the following<sup>11</sup>

Cet Auteur avoit à coup seur du génie infiniment, comme il écrivoit, pour ainsi dire, à tout hazard, il attiroit de tems en tems des traits inimitables, mais souvent ils sont accompagnés de choses si peu nobles, qu'on peut douter, si dans ses écrits la bassesse releve le sublime, ou si c'est le sublime qui fait sentir plus fortement la bassesse tuant tout de sa propre imagination, . . .

It would seem, then, that a journalist, who may never have read a line of Shakespeare, composed an article for the *Mercure* largely by lifting material from the *Journal littéraire*; that he knew the translation of Collier's *Short View*, borrowed from it the reference to obscenity, and mentioned Collier probably to give himself a reputation for honesty that he did not deserve, that a sentence in which he made a rough summary of what had been said in his sources was picked up by someone on the staff of the Bibliothèque

<sup>7</sup> *La Critique du Theatre Anglois, comparé au theatre d'Athenes, de Rome et de France, et l'opinion des Auteurs tant profanes que sâcrez touchant les Spectacles* De l'Anglois de M Collier Paris, Nicolas Simart, 1715. I am obliged to my colleague, Dr. Malakis, for the loan of his copy of this book

<sup>8</sup> P 83

<sup>9</sup> *Op cit.*, p. 58.

<sup>10</sup> *ix*, 157-216

<sup>11</sup> *Dissertation*, p 203

du Roi and was copied on the slip originally made out by Nicolas Clément. It follows that, apart from translators of English writings, the first foreigner to devote more than a few words to Shakespeare was the author of this *Dissertation* of 1717.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

---

### JOHNSON'S SHAKESPEAREAN LABORS IN 1765

Little is known about Johnson's progress on his Shakespeare between 1756 and 1765, nor is the question whether there actually was progress during most of these years settled by Boswell. Johnson's *Proposals* were published in June, 1756, and it is reasonable to infer that in that year he was working on the first volume of his edition. In November, 1757, a month before the promised date of publication, Percy wrote that Johnson was still on the second volume,<sup>1</sup> and, in January, 1758, that he had not completed the third.<sup>2</sup> After 1758 references to Johnson's progress disappear from the record.

Although it is impossible to trace that progress volume by volume or year by year, it is possible to follow it quite closely in 1765. Hazen has shown that Johnson advertised publication for August 1 of that year, that on July 31 he postponed publication "for a few weeks," that in August and September he re-wrote certain of the notes too bitter in their criticism of Warburton, and that he finally published October 10, 1765.<sup>3</sup> The following items fill in the more important gaps in our chronology.

1. Johnson's note to *Othello* II. III. 81 ("King Stephen was a worthy peer," etc.) shows that he was still engaged on *Othello*, the last play in the eighth volume, some time after February 14, 1765, the date on which the *Reliques* were published:<sup>4</sup> "These stanzas are taken from an old song, which the reader will find recovered and preserved in a curious work lately printed, intituled, *Relics* of

<sup>1</sup> Letter dated Nov. 24, 1757 Hans Hecht, *Thomas Percy und William Shenstone (Quellen und Forschungen)*, 103) Strassburg, 1909, p. 4. Johnson had promised publication by Christmas, 1757. *Proposals*, 1756, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Hecht, p. 9

<sup>3</sup> Allen T. Hazen, "Johnson's Shakespeare: A Study in Cancellation," *Times Literary Supplement*, Dec 24, 1938, p. 820

<sup>4</sup> L. F. Powell, "Percy's Reliques," *The Library*, 4th Ser., IX (1928), 123.

*Ancient Poetry, consisting of old heroic Ballads, Songs, &c* 3 vols. 12mo." <sup>5</sup>

2. Heath's *A Revisal of Shakespear's Text* was published in February, 1765, and reviewed in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for February and March. The reviewer, commenting on Heath's dissatisfaction with the common reading of "gnat" for "quat" at *Othello*, v. 1. 11 ("I've rubbed this young quat almost to the sense"), correctly defined "quat" as "a pimple, which is very likely to be made *angry* by *rubbing*." <sup>6</sup> Johnson, in a note on this passage, similarly defines it. <sup>7</sup> If he was indebted to the *Gentleman's Magazine* reviewer for his understanding of the term—none of the editors or critics before him had understood it—we may infer that he was working on the final act of *Othello* in or after March, 1765. <sup>8</sup>

3. Probably he had completed the plays by May 18, 1765, for on that date he wrote Garrick to secure his favour. "That this prejudice may really be honest," he said, "I wish you would name such plays as you would see, and they shall be sent you." <sup>9</sup> There is no qualification to this offer: let Garrick name *any* play and it will be sent him.

4. Johnson's copy of Heath's *Revisal*, now at the Folger Shakespeare Library, carries on its fly-leaf in Johnson's hand the following words: "every man sees what escaped better eyes than his own In explaining this we try to restore when we should explain had authour published it, we should sit quietly down to find his meaning." In Johnson's Preface appears this sentence: "Had the authour published his own works, we should have sat quietly down to disentangle his intricacies, and clear his obscurities; but now we tear what we cannot loose, and eject what we happen not to understand." <sup>10</sup> This sentence, in conjunction with scores of the notes and the tone of much of the Preface, elucidates the MS notation on the fly-leaf of the *Revisal*: "Such critics of Shakespeare as

<sup>5</sup> Johnson, ed., *The Plays of William Shakespeare*, London, 1765, viii 373, n. 4.

<sup>6</sup> *Gent Mag* xxxv (March, 1765), 111.

<sup>7</sup> viii. 449, n. 9.

<sup>8</sup> Lounsbury has suggested, however, that Johnson was indebted to an earlier definition which appeared in the *British Magazine* (1748), p. 425 (Thomas R Lounsbury, *The Text of Shakespeare*, N Y, 1906, p 518, n 1)

<sup>9</sup> G B Hill, ed., *Letters of Samuel Johnson*, Oxford, 1892, i 116-117.

<sup>10</sup> Johnson's *Shakespeare*, i sig [C7v].

Theobald and Gray perceive matters that eluded Pope and Warburton. This phenomenon is only to be explained by the fact that we editors have attempted to restore, that is, to emend the text instead of to explain it. Had Shakespeare published his own works, the doubt to which we all succumb—that obscurities in the text are the result of corruption—would be dissolved, and instead of changing the text to make it meaningful, we should find meaning in it as it stands." Quite clearly, I think, we have in the *Revisal* a rough draft of the sentence that appeared in the Preface, which proves that Johnson wrote the Preface after February, 1765.

5. After Johnson completed editing the plays for volume VIII, and after the compositors had set them up, he compiled the Appendix to his edition. That he completed compiling it after the presses had run off *Romeo and Juliet*, *Hamlet*, and *Othello* is evident from the fact that the notes on these plays in the Appendix refer by page number to the passages under consideration. And that Johnson compiled, not simply the last portion but all of the Appendix after completing the plays is evident from the fact that references to Heath occur in all portions.

6. Whether Johnson undertook the Appendix before the Preface or *vice versa* is not certain, but the Preface speaks not at all of Heath while the Appendix cites his opinions many times. We may infer, I think, that Johnson did not study the *Revisal* carefully until he had completed the Preface. Otherwise it is difficult to see why he should have omitted discussion of Heath in that portion of the Preface wherein he treats his predecessors.

On the basis of such evidence, we can tentatively chart Johnson's progress in 1765. At the beginning of the year he may still have been working on *Hamlet*. Sometime after the middle of February he was working on *Othello*, which he completed between March and the middle of May; sometime thereafter he wrote his Preface, and, after that, the Appendix. Then, at the end of July he decided to revise certain notes; he re-wrote these in August and September; and, on October 10, he published his Shakespeare. It is unlikely that he worked steadily on his edition from 1756 to 1765, but the evidence is slight. Although Boswell met Johnson in May, 1763, and did not leave London until August, he apparently learned nothing of Johnson's editorial undertaking or he surely would have informed us. He did learn, however, that Johnson "generally went abroad at four in the afternoon, and seldom came

home till two in the morning,"<sup>11</sup> hours which, it would seem, when added to those for sleeping and life's necessities, left no great amount of working time.

The suggestion negatively provided by such information, or lack of it, that Johnson simply ceased working on Shakespeare for a period of some duration is supported by evidence from the edition itself. For fourteen of Shakespeare's plays Johnson listed the sources from which he had drawn variant readings. For *Midsummer Night's Dream*, for example, he has the following note:

The various Readings of this Play.

- I A Quarto printed for *James Roberts*, 1600
- II The Folio of 1623
- III The Folio of 1632
- IV The Folio of 1664.<sup>12</sup>

In the first six volumes Johnson enumerated the sources of his variants with Roman numerals, as in the example just given. After the sixth volume, he listed them in Arabic numerals. Coincidental with this change in practice are two other changes, both similarly occurring between the sixth and seventh volumes. In the first six volumes of Johnson's edition, there are many unnumbered notes. There are, for example, thirty-five such notes for *Lear*, the first play in volume VI, and twenty for *Coriolanus*, the last, but for *Julus Caesar*, the first play in volume VII, there are no unnumbered notes, and for *Troilus*, the last play, only three. Again, through the first six volumes, Johnson reprinted notes from Theobald's first and second editions, retaining the archaic capitalization, spelling, and punctuation of the originals. After the sixth volume, however, he normalized all of Theobald's notes.

It is entirely possible that Johnson might gradually or abruptly have arrived at any or all of these changes of practice or policy in the uninterrupted course of his editing. But it is not likely that he would have arrived at all three changes simultaneously if there had not been an interruption of some length in his work. There may have been several lengthy interruptions; almost certainly there was at least one.

ARTHUR M. EASTMAN

*University of Michigan*

---

<sup>11</sup> G B Hill and L F Powell, eds, *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, Oxford, 1934, I 398

<sup>12</sup> Johnson's *Shakespeare*, I, 88

DR. JOHNSON IN *PARTIBUS INFIDELIUM*?

In 1764 when the Rev. Hugh Blair was about to lease the apartment owned by David Hume at James's Court in Edinburgh, he wrote his good friend and future landlord: "I am very happy in the thoughts of being your Tennant. . . . I intend to design my Self, *Episcopus in partibus Infidelium* and my Country Brethren must all necessarily drink the health of the Lord of the Manor when they visit me."<sup>1</sup> Basking in the adulation of Paris, Hume nostalgically wished, "twice or thrice a day, for my easy chair and my retreat in James's Court."<sup>2</sup> Upon his return from France in 1766, his tenant vacated the apartment; and he and his sister took possession again. Early the next year, however, Hume left Edinburgh once more to reside in London as Under-Secretary of State for the Northern Department. "I returned to Edinburgh in 1769," he comments in *My Own Life*, "very opulent (for I possessed a Revenue of 1000 pounds a Year) healthy, and though somewhat stricken in Years, with the Prospect of enjoying long my Ease and of seeing the Encrease of my Reputation."<sup>3</sup> In October of that year he informed a friend: "I live still, and must for a twelve-month, in my old House in James's Court, which is very chearful, and even elegant, but too small to display my great Talent for Cookery, the Science to which I intend to addict the remaining Years of my Life. . . ."<sup>4</sup> A year later he wrote, "I am engag'd in the building a house", and by 27 October 1771, Benjamin Franklin could write from Edinburgh: "Thro' Storms and Floods I arriv'd here . . . and was lodg'd miserably at an Inn: But that excellent Christian David Hume, agreeable to the Precepts of the Gospel, has *received* the Stranger, and I now live with him at his House in the new Town most happily."<sup>5</sup> Yet it was not until 24 February 1772, that Hume seems to have begun dating letters

<sup>1</sup> Blair, MS letter, 6 April 1764, in Hume MSS, Royal Society of Edinburgh, III, 52.

<sup>2</sup> In *Letters of David Hume* (ed. J. Y. T. Greig, Oxford, 1932), I, 412

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 208

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 232, and Franklin, *Works* (ed. A. H. Smyth, New York, 1907), v, 344.

from St. Andrews Square.<sup>6</sup> At James's Court his new tenant was James Boswell.

Boswell was certainly residing in Hume's *house* (as the apartment was called in the local parlance) by Whitsunday, 1772.<sup>7</sup> On 14 August of the following year, Boswell received Dr. Johnson as his guest: "Mr. Johnson and I walked arm-in-arm up the High Street to my house in James's Court."<sup>8</sup> Four days later the two set out on the tour of the Hebrides, returning 10 November for another ten days at James's Court before Johnson finally left for London. During neither visit with Boswell did Johnson see Scotland's greatest man of letters; but it was hardly to be expected that he would tolerate the presence of David Hume. How unlike another great English man of letters, Gibbon, who in that very summer of 1773 chided a friend visiting Edinburgh: "You tell me of a long list of dukes, lords, and chieftains of renown to whom you are introduced; were I with you, I should prefer one *David* to them all"<sup>9</sup> It was at James's Court, indeed, that Johnson named Hume a blockhead and a rogue—a piece of invective that Boswell saw fit to suppress in the published *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides with Samuel Johnson, LL. D.* as "*something much too rough*."<sup>10</sup>

As the guest of Boswell, then, was Johnson unwittingly living in *partibus Infidelium*? The picture of the Great Moralist innocently drinking to "the Lord of the Manor" and thereby in reality toasting the Great Infidel has intrigued or disturbed the commentators; and the *pro's* and *con's* of the situation have been explored but without general agreement. The facts hitherto available have not been easy to interpret. There is, on the one hand, Hume's own assurance that his apartment was "the third story of James's

<sup>6</sup> Unpublished letter of 24 February 1772, which will be included in the volume of Hume letters supplementary to Greig's edition on which Professors Raymond Klibansky of Oriel College, Oxford, and W. G. MacLagan of Glasgow University are collaborating with the present writer

<sup>7</sup> Boswell, *Private Papers from Malahide Castle* (ed. G. Scott and F. A. Pottle, privately printed, New York, 1928-34), under 15<sup>th</sup> and 17 May 1773. Though residing at St. Andrews Square, Hume apparently was not completely removed from James's Court before May 1773. See Hume, *Letters*, II, 261

<sup>8</sup> *Boswell's Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides with Samuel Johnson, LL. D.* (ed. F. A. Pottle and C. H. Bennett, New York, 1936), p. 11

<sup>9</sup> Gibbon, *Miscellaneous Works* (ed. Lord Sheffield, London, 1814), II, 110

<sup>10</sup> *Boswell's Journal or a Tour*, p. 17 and n. 10.



Court,"<sup>11</sup> that is, presumably the third story facing south and the sixth facing north since the apartment house was built on the side of the steep ridge of the Castle Hill. And, on the other hand, there is Johnson's assurance in a letter written from James's Court that, "Boswell has very handsome and spacious rooms, level with the ground on one side of the house, and on the other four stories high."<sup>12</sup>

The contradictions between these two descriptions may be explained away if one wants to, and there is sufficient reason for wanting to, in addition to the making possible a good anecdote, in the fact that Boswell records in his diaries on 28 October 1774, and again on 6 March 1775, that he paid Hume six months' rent for the apartment in James's Court<sup>13</sup> In other words, at least as late as March 1775, Boswell was still Hume's tenant. The two descriptions of the location of the apartment may perhaps be reconciled by assuming, first, that Hume meant the third story facing north (which would be the ground floor facing south) and, second, that his "third story" really meant the fourth floor according to the modern American and somewhat more logical usage<sup>14</sup> These assumptions are not completely convincing, however, and smack somewhat of special-pleading. Yet they do have the merit of recognizing that at the time of Dr. Johnson's visit Boswell was the tenant of Hume.

Certain other facts must be taken into consideration. Among the Hume manuscripts at the Royal Society of Edinburgh is a document in Hume's hand entitled "Memorial for Mr Hume,"<sup>15</sup> which refers to a lawsuit brought against Hume for failure to pay a bill for repairs to the James's Court apartment. The memorial opens "At Whitsunday last, Mr. Boswal, Advocate, left Mr Hume's house in James's Court, and Lady Wallace, Dowager, came to it." This manuscript has not passed unnoticed, but is of little value to the point at issue because the year is nowhere mentioned. The lawsuit

<sup>11</sup> Hume, *Letters*, I, 367, and n. 2. For a full discussion, see Birkbeck Hill's edition of *Letters of David Hume to William Strahan* (Oxford, 1888), pp 116-19

<sup>12</sup> Johnson, *Letters* (ed G Birkbeck Hill, New York, 1892), I, 229.

<sup>13</sup> Boswell, *Private Papers*, x, 42, 109

<sup>14</sup> John Murray, "James Boswell in Edinburgh" (unpublished dissertation at Yale University, 1939), I, 236-43, Appendix III, on "Boswell's Flat in James's Court" See especially, pp 242-43

<sup>15</sup> MS ix, 19.

referred to, however, was tried before the Baillie Court, and the legal documents concerned are to be found in the Edinburgh City Chambers among "Unextracted Baillie Court Processes."<sup>16</sup>

Chief of these documents is a letter of mandate from Hume to a certain John Watson, evidently a *writer* or solicitor,<sup>17</sup> directing Watson to appear for him before the Bailles. Dated, "St Andrews Square, 19 of Feby 1774," the letter opens

I desire you to appear for me before the Baillies in consequence of the enclosed Summons The Story is this I have a House in James's Court, which I let in lease to Mr Boswal, Advocate He left it last Whitsunday before the Expiration of his Lease, and let it to Lady Wallace. As there was some Plaister broke down in the Kitchen, Mrs Boswal, that she might leave things in good Repair, sent for this Gillies, who summons me, in order to throw a little Plaister on the walls.

The letter proceeds with a tale of minor eighteenth-century labor racketeering. Adam Gilles or Gillies, mason, having been engaged to do one job, proceeded on his own initiative to make other and unneeded repairs; Hume, refusing to pay the inflated bill, was summoned before the court. The story is amusing but hardly pertinent. Suffice it to say, the Baillies, who were generally on the side of tradespeople, ruled against Hume; and all his protests proved fruitless.

Boswell's situation at James's Court may now be reconstructed and the question contained in the title to this note answered. The true explanation requires no finespun argument. On Whitsunday, 1773, Boswell removed from Hume's apartment to the larger ground-floor apartment on the same stair. And, as he was leaving after but one year's residence and before the expiration of his lease (evidently for three years) he sub-let Hume's apartment to Lady Wallace. So, although Boswell was Hume's tenant in the summer and autumn of 1773, Dr Johnson—happily or unhappily—was not *in partibus Infidelium*. It would surely be stretching those infidel regions too far to include all of James's Court!

ERNEST CAMPBELL MOSSNER

*The University of Texas*

---

<sup>16</sup> City Chambers, Edinburgh, Bundle No 396 (50). Quotations are made by permission, the unpublished Hume letter will be included in the forthcoming volume mentioned above

<sup>17</sup> Beyond the fact that Watson was neither a Solicitor before the Supreme Court nor a Writer to the Signet, nothing is known about him. He was apparently restricted to practice before the minor courts.

Der ewige Augenblick hat seine besondere Stunde, die der Dämmerung, unmittelbar vor dem Zunachten. Das ist die christliche Todeskontemplation, aus der das klare körperhafte Licht der Griechen verschwunden ist. Denn für die Griechen war es die Stunde des Pan, wenn die heisse regungslose Sommerluft, kurz nach Mittag, das elementare Leben aus dem Waldschatten hervortreten liess. Dämmerung und Tod sind an deren Stelle getreten, wodurch sich das Erlebnis als christlich-modern ausweist. Dieses Abendliche des christlichen Empfindens, in dem der ewige Augenblick aus dem mittäglichen Licht in die Dämmerung rückt und man statt Pan dem Tode begegnet, ist schon bei Augustin ausgesprochen, wenn er sagt:

Scientia creaturae in comparatione scientiae Creatoris quodammodo  
vesperascit.<sup>4</sup>

Es ist dieser Uebergang von Licht und Körperlichkeit zu Dämmerung und Auflösung, womit Hermann Broch, als wichtiges Thema in seinem Vergilroman, die Zeitenwende verdeutlicht hat.<sup>5</sup>

Mit silbergrauem Duft des dunklen Tales  
Verschwammen meine dammernden Gedanken,  
Und still versank ich in dem webenden,  
Durchsichtigen Meere und verliess das Leben

Dem Dichter entgleitet langsam das Bewusstsein, seine Gedanken werden undeutlich, assoziativ, wesentlich, bildhaft, und er versinkt im Meere des Beziehungsreichen, stirbt. Stirbt aber nicht bewusstlos, sondern überbewusst, er erlebt seinen eignen Tod, so wie, im vierten Teil seines Buchs *Der Tod des Vergil* Hermann Broch den Dichter seinen Tod erleben lässt. Einige Zeilen weiter unten heisst es im Gedicht.

Und dieses wusst ich,  
Obgleich ichs nicht begreife, doch ich wusst es  
Das ist der Tod.

Im Tode weiss er, dass er tot ist. So muss die christliche Seele nach der Auflösung des Leibes empfinden. Aber das Gedicht, obwohl erst in der christlichen Ueberlieferung möglich, will nicht ein christliches, sondern ein dichterisches Erlebnis beschreiben

<sup>4</sup> Augustinus, *De Civitate Dei*, libr. XI, cap. 7.

<sup>5</sup> Hermann Broch, *Der Tod des Vergil* (New York: Pantheon, 1945).

Aber seltsam!

Ein namenloses Heimweh weinte lautlos  
In meiner Seele nach dem Leben, weinte,  
Wie einer weint, wenn er auf grossem Seeschiff  
Mit gelben Riesenregeln gegen Abend  
Auf dunkelblauem Wasser an der Stadt,  
Der Vaterstadt, vorbeifahrt

Wieder ist es wie ein Echo aus *Der Tor und der Tod* in der Sterbestunde stellt sich das Heimweh nach dem Leben und die Erkenntnis dieses Lebens ein. Auch dem Brochschen Vergil scheint sein Tod wie die Meerfahrt auf einem grossen Schiff, das langsam verschwindet, so wie auch der Prinz von Homburg in seiner vermeintlichen Sterbestunde es sich vorstellt:

Und wie ein Schiff, vom Hauch des Winds entfuht,  
Die muntre Hafenstadt versinken sieht,  
So geht mir dammend alles Leben unter

Leben aber, als Einssein mit der Welt, noch ohne "des Gedankens Blasse," erscheint bei Hofmannsthal als die Kindheit:

Da sieht er

Die Gassen, hort die Brunnen rauschen, riecht  
Den Duft der Fliederbusche, sieht sich selber,  
Ein Kind, am Ufer stehn, mit Kindesaugen,  
Die angstlich sind und weinen wollen

Er sieht sich selbst, mit seinem leiblichen, gestorbenen Auge, so wie er einmal war. Die leibliche Begegnung mit der eignen Person ist im Volksmythos und in der romantischen Dichtung fast immer mit dem Tode verknüpft, unter anderm als das Doppelgangermotiv. (Auch die Symbolik des Spiegels spielt hier herein.) Hier freilich ist die Abfolge umgekehrt: nicht weil er sich selber sieht, muss er sterben, sondern er sieht sich, weil er gestorben ist. Die Ablosung der lebendigen Seele vom in der Dämmerung liegenden Leib findet ein geheimnisvolles Symbol:

sieht

Durchs offene Fenster Licht in seinem Zimmer

Das Ich, das andre und wahre Ich, das dem Leben angehört, offenbart sich durch das Licht im eignen Zimmer. Das Licht zeigt, dass das Zimmer bewohnt ist; er hat es selber angezündet und konnte, stände er vorm Fenster, sich selber handeln und leben

sehen Die eigne Lampe dort drinnen ist das deutlichste Symbol dafür, dass er wirklich gestorben ist.

Das grosse Seeschiff aber trägt ihn weiter  
Auf dunkelblauem Wasser lautlos gleitend  
Mit gelben fremdgeformten Riesensegeln

Damit schliesst das Gedicht. Er fährt am Leben, das seine Kindheit war, vorüber.

Mit dieser Erklärung des Hofmannsthalschen Gedichts ist gleichzeitig und beinahe Zeile für Zeile auch eines der Droste miterklart, *Im Moose* <sup>6</sup>

Als jungst die Nacht dem sonnenmuden Land  
Der Dämmung leise Boten hat gesandt,  
Da lag ich einsam noch in Waldes Moose  
Die dunklen Zweige nickten so vertraut,  
An meiner Wange flüsterte das Kraut,  
Unsichtbar duftete die Heiderose

Wieder ist es die Erfahrung des Alleinseins in der Natur, in der Dammerstunde, unmittelbar vorm Nachtdunkel, wobei der verstärkte Dammerduft der Natur die Sinne einwiegt, kurz vor dem Erlebnis.

Und flimmern sah ich durch der Linde Raum  
Ein mattes Licht, das im Gezweig der Baum  
Gleich einem macht'gen Gluhwurm schien zu tragen,  
Es sah so dammernd wie ein Traumgesicht,  
Doch wusste ich, es war der Heimat Licht,  
In meiner eignen Kammer angeschlagen

Das Licht im eignen Zimmer, halb noch wirklich, halb wie im Traum gesehen, ist auch hier das Zeichen des abgelosten Ich, des entschwundenen Lebens. Denn "Heimat" hat hier deutlich einen vollen Doppelsinn: das nahe eigne Haus wurde die Dichterin nicht "Heimat" nennen, wenn es ihr nicht auch zum Sinnbild allen verfloffenen Jugendlebens geworden wäre.<sup>7</sup> Auch hier kommt das Licht aus dem eignen Kammerfenster der Jugendzeit.

Ringsum so still, dass ich vernahm im Laub  
Der Raupe Nagen, und wie grüner Staub  
Mich leise wirbelnd Blatterflockchen trafen.  
Ich lag und dachte, ach, so Manchem nach,  
Ich horte meines eignen Herzens Schlag,  
Fast war es mir, als sei ich schon entschlafen.

<sup>6</sup> Annette von Droste-Hulshoff, *Sämtliche Werke* (München. Georg Müller, 1925) I, 74.

Da tritt das Erlebnis ein · sie stirbt. Mit demselben elegisch-atmendem Ton, als Akzent am Ende der Zeile, wie das Hofmannsthalsche "und verliess das Leben" wird hier das Sterben ausgedrückt.

Gedanken tauchten aus Gedanken auf,  
Das Kinderspiel, der frischen Jahre Lauf,  
Gesichter, die mir lange fremd geworden,  
Vergessne Tone summten um mein Ohr.

Annette verfügt noch nicht über die reiche Traum- und Seelensprache des österreichischen Dichters, aber der Vorgang "Gedanken tauchen aus Gedanken auf" ist derselbe wie der des Verschwimmens und Webens dammernder Gedanken, die ins Wesentliche, in den verlorenen Besitz des Lebens, die Kinderzeit, herabsteigen

Und endlich trat die Gegenwart hervor,  
Da stand die Welle, wie an Ufers Rändern

Nach jenem einst genossenen Leben holt die ursprüngliche Bewegung auf: die Welle steht, das Leben selber ist zu Ende. Dies ist der Punkt des Erlebnisses, an dem Hofmannsthals Gedicht abbricht. In den folgenden vier Strophen fugt auch Annette dem Erlebnis keinen neuen Inhalt hinzu, sie führt es nur mit einer grausamen Genauigkeit zu Ende.

Dann, gleich dem Bronnen, der verrinnt im Schlund  
Und drüben wieder sprudelt aus dem Grund,  
So stand ich plötzlich in der Zukunft Lande,  
Ich sah mich selber, gar gebuckt und klein,  
Geschwachten Auges, am ererbten Schrein  
Sorgfältig ordnen staub'ge Liebespfande.  
Die Bilder meiner Lieben sah ich klar,  
In einer Tracht, die jetzt veraltet war,  
Mich sorgsam lösen aus verblichenen Hüllen . . .

Wenn die verronnene Welle wieder zum Vorschein kommt, sieht sich die Dichterin selbst, so wie Hofmannsthal sich auch selbst gesehen hatte in der Stunde seines Todes. Nur zeichnet sich Annette hier mit einem erbarmungslosen *desengaño* als karge alte Jungfer, die sie bald sein wird, nur noch von vergangnem Leben zehrend. Die Lebensreise wird hier nicht als Seefahrt auf grossem Schiffe gesehen, aber auch hier ist es das Wasser, der hingleitende Fluss, mit dem sich der Lebensablauf und die Todesfahrt bezeichnet.

Und—horch, die Wachtel schlug! Kuhl strich der Hauch—  
 Und noch zuletzt sah ich, gleich einem Rauch,  
 Mich leise in der Erde Poren ziehen  
 Ich fuhr empor und schüttelte mich dann,  
 Wie einer, der dem Scheintod erst entrann,  
 Und taumelte entlang die dunklen Hage,  
 Noch immer zweifelnd, ob der Stern am Rain  
 Sei wirklich meiner Schlummerlampe Schein  
 Oder das ew'ge Licht am Sarkophage

Der wirkliche Wachtelschlag, noch im Traume gehort, weckt sie auf, so wie Rustan in Grillparzers *Der Traum ein Leben* durch den wirklichen Schlag der Uhr, der beiden Sphären angehört, von einem Leben ins andre gerufen wird. Was oben nur sinnbildlich angedeutet wurde, dass das Licht im eignen Kammerfenster auch zugleich das Licht des Todes ist, des nicht mehr gelebten Lebens, wird nun, am Schluss, ausgesprochen.

Es gibt wohl wenige Fälle, in denen zwei Gedichte dasselbe Erlebnis mit so ähnlichen Mitteln und Symbolen behandeln. Es ist sehr wohl möglich, dass Annettes Gedichte zu Hofmannsthals ausserer oder geistiger Bibliothek gehört haben, und dass seine Verse ein, sicherlich unbewusstes, deutliches Echo der früheren sind. Das hiesse noch keineswegs, dass der Titel *Erlebnis* unzutreffend und das Gedicht selber nur Folge eines Bildungserlebnisses zweiter Hand wäre. Denn grade dann, wenn ein Dichter ein ihm ganz gehörendes Grunderlebnis woanders vorgebildet findet, wird er aufhören, angestossen werden, das Gedicht selber vielleicht vergessen und später im eignen Gedicht sein eignes Erlebnis mit den Mitteln jenes Halbvergessenen beschreiben.

Vielleicht aber gehört dieses Erlebnis gar nicht nur diesen beiden an, vielleicht ist es ein dichterisches Grunderlebnis überhaupt. Auch steht ja Annette, wie Hofmannsthal, besonders deutlich in der katholischen Ueberlieferung. Vielleicht ist sogar das Licht im eignen Kammerfenster ein archetypisches, gewissermassen "natürliches" Symbol, das jeder, der Symbole lesen kann, wieder findet. Eines jedenfalls ist klar: das Hofmannsthalsche Grunderlebnis, wie es sich in *Der Tor und der Tod* und in diesem Gedichte ausdrückt, ist nicht, wie so lange geglaubt wurde, das eines todes-süchtigen, lebensunfähigen Aestheten, Zeichen für ein zu Ende gehendes Jahrhundert reicher Erben, denn Annette, die von keiner dieser Bezeichnungen getroffen werden kann, hat dasselbe erlebt.

A SOURCE OF HOFFMANN'S *DER KAMPF DER SÄNGER*

Hoffmann's story of the Wartburg minstrels *Der Kampf der Sanger* was written in the autumn of 1817 and appeared late in 1818 in Brockhaus's *Urana, Taschenbuch auf das Jahr 1819*, at the same time it was included in the second volume of the *Serapionsbrüder*. There it was assigned to Cyprian, who himself acknowledges his indebtedness to Wagenseil's famous *Chronik von Nürnberg* for material.

In his edition of Hoffmann's works, Volume VI, Carl Georg von Maassen examines the extensive literature on the Wartburg story but with very meagre results as far as Hoffmann's tale is concerned. He lists many books and articles which either certainly or in all probability Hoffmann never saw, and as a result narrows Hoffmann's sources almost exclusively to the one work that Hoffmann (Cyprian) mentions. For some minor details, such as a few names that are not found in Wagenseil, Maassen plausibly conjectures that Hoffmann consulted a work on Thuringian or specifically Wartburg history. He assumes that Hoffmann probably knew that the legend of the minstrels' contest goes back to the mediæval poem or is at least closely connected with it. A large part of Hoffmann's story is, of course, entirely his own invention.

Maassen, however, has failed to find the probable first source of Hoffmann's interest in the Wartburg contest, one that probably supplied him with a hint for the major element of his plot. In the issues of *Der Freimuthige*, edited at that time by Kotzebue and G. Merkel, for April 27, 28, 1804 (nos. 84, 85, pp. 333-35, 338-339), C. Schreiber published an article entitled "*Über die Minnesänger und ihren Krieg auf der Wartburg*." That Hoffmann saw and read this article would seem practically certain. In September of the previous year (September 9, 1803) this periodical published his *Sendschreiben eines Klostergeistlichen*, Hoffmann's first work to see the light in printed form. In the same month he had sent his drama *Der Preis* to *Der Freimuthige* in competition for a prize that Kotzebue was offering for a comedy, and he had been eagerly scanning the pages of the periodical for the announcement of the award, which appeared in the issue of February 11, 1804.



In addition to Wagenseil, Maassen thinks that Hoffmann probably made use of a recent work on the Wartburg, J. C. S. Thon's *Schloss Wartburg. Ein Beitrag zur Kunde der Vorzeit*,<sup>1</sup> finding there all he needed to supplement his major source. It is significant that Schreiber in *Der Freimuthige* article refers the reader to this one book for further information, which fortifies the supposition that Hoffmann used Thon's book.

Hoffmann nowhere mentions the Landgräfin Sophia, Hermann's wife, and Maassen quite correctly conjectures that he has for the purposes of his plot transformed her into the Gräfin Mathilde von Falkenstein, taking the name Mathilde from Novalis's *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*. Maassen quotes from Friedrich Rassmann's *Literarisches Handwörterbuch der verstorbenen deutschen Dichter* (Leipzig, 1826) which in reference to the Wartburg contest records: "Der Eintritt der schonen Landgräfin Sophia brachte Ofterdingen aus der Fassung und entriss ihm den fast schon entschiedenen Sieg," but he has been unable to find any source for this suggestion of a relation between Ofterdingen and the Landgräfin, though it seems significant for Hoffmann's tale. But the episode was already related in Schreiber's narrative,—and with a much more direct suggestion of the element upon which Hoffmann built his Ofterdingen-Mathilde story: "Da trat die schöne Sophie, die Landgräfin von Thüringen, in den Versammlungssaal, und der entflammte Dichter blickte zu lang in ihr grosses feuriges Auge. . . . Er wurde bestürzt und verworren, seine Gegner benutzten den Augenblick, und Ofterdingen ward zum erstenmale besiegt. Die erzürnten Meister waren konsequent genug, das Urtheil an ihm zu vollziehen und ihn den Händen des Henkers zu übergeben—aber er floh in den Schutz der ihn liebenden Fürstin, barg sich unter ihrem Mantel, und sie, die wider ihren Willen schuld an seinem Unfall war, ward nun auch seine gutige Retterin." It seems obvious that Hoffmann derived the main motif in his story from this passage in Schreiber's article.

HARVEY W. HEWETT-THAYER

*Princeton University*

---

<sup>1</sup> Maassen refers to the "vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage," Eisenach, 1815; first edition, Gotha, 1795

EIN UNBEKANNTER HOCHDEUTSCHER *REINICKE*  
*FUCHS* VON 1577

Einem Brief von Taylor Starck entnehme ich dankbar den folgenden Hinweis: 'Incidental to the discovery in private hand in Cambridge of the fourth printing of the High German version of the Low German *Reinke de vos* (Lubeck 1498) which appeared in Frankfurt in 1562, I have learned that Collitz had a printing not listed in the bibliographies! The Collitz copy was printed in Frankfurt 1577 and therefore comes between N<sup>os</sup> 9 and 10 of the list given by Friedrich Prien in his edition of *Reinke de vos* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1887), p. xliii.'

In dieser Angabe ist alles Wesentliche enthalten, sie läßt sich noch ergänzen durch eine Bleistift-Notiz, von Collitz selbst auf die Rückseite des Vorsatzblatts geschrieben. 'Diese Ausgabe wird weder von Grimm, *Reinhart Fuchs* S. CLXXVIII noch von Goedeke II, 322 erwähnt. Sie fällt zwischen die dort verzeichneten Auflagen von 1574 und 1579.' Da der Druck von 1574 mit dem neunten in Priens Liste identisch ist, kommt also dem Exemplar der *Collitz Collection* nunmehr die Nummer 9a zu. Doch gibt der Druck Anlaß zu einigen Bemerkungen.

Nicolaus Basse tritt als Drucker eines *Reinicke Fuchs* schon 1569 auf; dort ist aber Simon Hutter der Verleger (vgl. Prien a. a. O.). Die nächsten beiden Frankfurter Drucke stammen nicht von ihm, der also erst 1579 wieder in Erscheinung tritt. Das Impressum auf dem Schlußblatt nennt nur den Drucker, *Nicolaum Bassaeum*, der also wohl zugleich Verleger ist und es auch in allen folgenden Drucken des 16. Jahrhunderts bleibt.

Nun ist aber dieser Druck von 1579 nach Wortlaut, Rechtschreibung, Zeilenbruch und Zeichensetzung der Titelseite, sowie nach Blattzahl völlig identisch mit dem Exemplar Collitz,' bis auf den Druckvermerk, der nämlich als Drucker einen *Franciscum Basseum* angibt 'in verlegung Nicolai/ Bassei, Gebr./ Darunter: Druckersignet / M. D. LXXVII. Der bei Prien der Ausgabe von 1579 zugeschriebene neue Holzschnitt zu III, 11 kommt schon unserm Exemplar zu, das überhaupt in jedem Betracht als Original-Ausgabe anzusehen ist, der 1579 nur ein neuer Druckvermerk angehängt ist.

Was der Anlaß dazu war, daß die gemeinsame Firma der Bruder Basse in den Alleinbesitz von Nicolaus übergang, weiß ich nicht. Aber daß im Jahre 1577 für kurze Zeit neben Nicolaus sein Bruder Franz in der Offizin tätig war, beweist ein in meinem Besitz befindlicher *Albertus Magnus* des gleichen Jahres 1577; dessen Impressum so lautet. *Gedruckt zu Franckfurt / am Mayn, durch Franciscum / Bassaeum, in verlegung Ni-/colai Bassaei, Gebru. / Im Jar. Darunter Druckersignet / M. D. LXXVII.* Franz muß 1579 ausgeschieden sein, die Firma legt die Bezeichnung 'Gebrüder' ab, der Rest der Ausgabe erhält ein neues Schlußblatt, auf dem Nicolaus als Alleininhaber erscheint.

Somit ist der neue, als 9a rangierende Druck der einzige, an dem Franz Basse Anteil hat.

Der Vollständigkeit halber sei noch erwähnt, dass die Johns Hopkins Universitätsbibliothek ausser dem Unikum der *Collitz Collection* den schönen Foliodruck von 1545 besitzt, der bei Prien a. a. O. XL f. als *zweiter* hochdeutscher beschrieben ist. Prien kennt davon 14 Exemplare.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

### BLACKWELL'S [MEDIEVAL] GERMAN TEXTS

Es verdient jede Art von Zuspruch und Ermutigung, wenn heute ein englischer Verleger die Unternehmungslust für eine Reihe von mittelhochdeutschen Textausgaben aufbringt, für die doch auf einen breiten Markt kaum zu rechnen ist. Die sprachlichen Barrikaden sind hoch genug, das genußsuchende Publikum abzuhalten, das längst an modernisierende Überarbeitungen gewohnt ist, und selbst Studenten der Germanistik wenden sich der neueren Literatur zu, bei der die linguistischen Schwierigkeiten geringer sind. So erblicke ich meine vornehmste Aufgabe darin, dem Wagnis der schnell wachsenden Serie, die der Oxford Verleger Blackwell unter dem Titel *Blackwell's German Texts* seit 1947 veröffentlicht, Erfolg zu wünschen und dem Unternehmen Förderliches zu sagen. Da ist zunächst einmal die Auswahl, die besser nicht zu treffen wäre. Mit Hartmann, Walther, Gottfried sind die drei Sterne erster Grosse des klassischen Siebengestirns präsentiert; die spathofische Zeit ist durch *Meier Helmbrecht*, der Meistergesang im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung durch Hans Sachs musterhaft vertreten. Abgesehen

von *Nibelungenlied* und *Parzival*, den Lyrikern Reinmar und Morungen, sollten Neidhart, Stricker und Freidank für die Rundung des Bildes herangezogen werden; für das 14. Jahrhundert wäre ein Abdruck des *Achermann aus Bohmen*, für das 15. einer des *Narrenschiff* am Platze. Womit das Gediegenste aus dem Vorrat alterer deutscher Dichtung in die Scheuern eingebracht wäre.

Lobenswert ist weiterhin Anordnung und buchtechnische Ausstattung der Serie. Während die deutschen Textausgaben oft buchdruckerische Greuel darstellten, sind Blackwells Bücher handlich, typologisch klar und sauber. Die Texte selbst sind umrahmt von Bibliographien, Einleitungen, Kommentaren und Vokabular, so daß der kritische Leser zum Wortlaut der Dichtung den Apparat erhält, auf dem Textherstellung und Textdeutung beruht. Es ist nun gerade der etwas anspruchsvolle Reichtum an diesen Zutaten, der es nötig macht, an die Serie den kritischsten Maßstab zu legen.

Da drängt sich dem Betrachter als recht seltsam ein gewisser Konservatismus der Editionstechnik auf, eine Unempfindlichkeit für die neueren Grundsätze der Textherstellung, ein Unwille, den Richtungen zu folgen, die von der Forschung in den letzten Jahrzehnten eingeschlagen sind. Ich weiss nicht, wie die Herausgeber ein so retardierendes Verfahren rechtfertigen wie, daß im Falle der Auswahl aus Walther immer noch die 9. Ausgabe Lachmanns zugrunde gelegt ist statt der seit 1936 allein gültigen 10.; daß Closs im *Tristan* noch immer Bechstein folgt, dessen Text nun schon dreimal—durch Golther, dann durch Marold, endlich durch Ranke—ausser Kurs gesetzt ist. Natürlich tut die auch im Apparat bemerkbare Tendenz zur Gestrigkeit der Verwendbarkeit der Ausgaben im Seminarbetrieb ernsten Abbruch. Daß die meisten der Bande in zweiter Auflage vorliegen, entschuldigt hier nichts, da sie schon beim ersten Erscheinen (1942) nicht *up to date* gewesen sind; und ich erwähne es hier nur, weil es mich der Mühe intensiverer Betrachtung enthebt, welche die Bande schon damals gefunden haben. So bleibt mir nicht viel mehr als nur nachzutragen.

In der Neuauflage von Bostocks *Armen Heinrich* (Oxford, 1947), pp. xl, 97, ist alles überarbeitet ausser dem Text, der weiterhin Gierach folgt. Es steht aber seit Litzmanns Aufsatz *ZsfvPh.* 53 (1928), 109 ff. fest, daß die Diskriminierung der Hs. B in dem früher üblichen Umfang unberechtigt ist, zu welcher Erkenntnis sich ja auch Gierach immer mehr durchgerungen hatte.

Ranke's Text, zu dem, wie es sich gehört, Gierach und Leitzmann Pate gestanden haben, ist sicherlich dem Bostocks überlegen.<sup>1</sup> Im Einzelnen ein paar Bemerkungen.

- v 19 *ar(e)beit* ist nicht immer so viel wie *trouble* Vgl. G. Schwarz, *arbeit bei mhd Dichtern* (Wurzburg, 1938), mit einem Anhang Dichtung als *arbeit* — Ferner B Boesch, *Die Kunstanschauung in der mhd Dichtung* (Bern, 1936), 22 f Anm 59 mit weiterer Literatur
- v. 48 kann man mit A oder B lesen, nur so wie der Vers jetzt aus beiden Hss zusammengestoppelt ist, steht der Artikel sinnwidrig, ich zoge vor *ez hiez der herre Heinrich*
- v 252 bedarf keiner Anmerkung, *sine armen fruunt* ist doch acc plur
- v. 325 Die in der Anmerkung versuchte Erklärung wird durch v 463 hinfallig
- v 327 Die Anmerkung ist überflüssig: *biwonen* kann den Genitiv nehmen
- v. 562 Hier, an der entscheidenden Stelle des Gedichts ist *muot* grade nicht 'purpose,' sondern 'Kraft des Denkens und des Wollens,' vgl Lexer I, 2241 f
- v 852 Druckfehler, lies *ez* statt *ew*
- v. 1170 scheint mir eher zu bedeuten Denn ich bin aus geringem Stoff (Staub) gemacht
- v 1379 *enbieten* bedeutet 'Botschaft senden,' nicht 'entbieten'
- v. 1412 Die im Vokabular gegebene Entwicklungsreihe von ahd *seltsāni* > mhd *seltsāne* > *seltsen* > nhd *seltsam* ist in dieser Form unrichtig *Seltsam* ist in der alten Sprache *seltsliche*, die spezifische Bedeutung von *selts-sāni* (*unsāni* = *deformis*) = *kaum gesund* muß erst verblasen, bevor Kontamination mit dem Suffix *-sam* möglich wird In unserm Gedicht ist die Grundbedeutung 'bemahe irre, kaum gesund' an beiden Textstellen noch unverkennbar Demnach ist zu übersetzen *almost insane*.

Die Auswahl aus Walther von der Vogelweide, für die Margaret F. Richey zeichnet (Oxford, 1948), pp. xxvi, 102, kann es mit der fast gleichzeitigen des Schweizers Max Wehrli aufnehmen. Nur daß letzterer natürlich auf der von CvKraus betreuten 10. Lachmann-Ausgabe fusst und Lesarten in generöser Fülle bietet. In M. Richeys gediegener Einföhrung storen ausser ein paar Druckfehlern Restbestände einer etwas blumig-biedermeierlichen Betrachtung des Dichterlebens, in ihrer Bibliographie ist *Minnesangs Frühling* doch tatsächlich in Vogts Ausgabe von 1920 verzeichnet, obwohl die nunmehr allein gültige Neufassung von Kraus zur Zeit der Zusammenstellung des hier besprochenen Bandes schon acht Jahre alt

<sup>1</sup> Die Ausgabe, Basel 1943 erschienen, fehlt in B s Bibliographie, die sonst Titel aus den Jahren 1944 und 1946 enthält.

war! Für die Bevorzugung der *Kleinen Heidelberger Liederhandschrift* (A) gibt es gesunde Gründe, im Einzelnen folgt ihr natürlich auch Frl. Richey, bevorzugt aber zuweilen recht eigenwillige Lesungen, für die man die Gründe gerne wusste.

3 7 (= Lachmann 56 20) ist entschieden verschlimmbessert

4 (= Lachmann 48 38) illustriert den Gegensatz von *wîp* und *rouwe*, ohne daß sich im Vokabular die erwarteten Bedeutungshilfen fanden

43 1 (= Lachmann 28 31) ist gelesen nach Hs C (*die* statt *du*), aber dann wäre auch Z 6 mit C *mînen*, Z 8 *arn* nötig, wozu sich R nicht versteht

Zum *in butzen wîs* der gleichen Nummer gibt das Vokabular unvollständige Auskunft. Das Wort findet sich auch in *Titurel*. Zur Bedeutung vgl. jetzt *Trubners Deutsches Wtb.* I, 482 = in plumper, grober Weise

Auf S 102 muß Nr 9 = Lachmann 65 23 korrigiert werden in 65 33

An ähnlichen Kleinigkeiten ist kein Mangel. Lieber drucke ich meine Zustimmung dazu aus, daß 40 Seiten Text von 23 Seiten subtilster Anmerkungen gefolgt werden, die eine Menge rhythmisch-metrischer, biographischer und philologischer Details verarbeiten, darunter nichts, was der Berichtigung bedarf.

Wenig befreunden kann ich mich mit der Behandlung, die Closs Gottfrieds *Tristan* (Oxford, 1947), pp. lx, 205, hat angedeihen lassen. Die Einleitung und manche Anmerkung sahen sicherlich anders aus, hatte Closs so wichtige Arbeiten berücksichtigt wie De Boors, 'Grundauffassung von Gottfrieds Tristan' *Dt. Vierteljahrschr.* XVIII (1940), 262-306 oder Schwietering's Berliner Akademieabhandlung *Der Tristan Gottfrieds und die Bernhardische Mystik* (Berlin, 1943). Und wer Stolltes motivgeschichtliche Untersuchungen von 1940/41 kennt, hatte doch wohl die Gandin-Episode nicht völlig fortgelassen. Die gemutvollen Wendungen, in denen sich Closs gern ergeht, sind Geschmacksache, zurückzuweisen ist aber, daß Eilhart die Tristansage 'introduced to the German public' (S. xxxi), was gleich zweimal falsch ist: daß wir von Eilharts Werk nicht eine komplette Hs. haben, beweist wohl die Fragwürdigkeit des Wortes 'public' (auch wenn die Tristanfortsetzer auf Eilhart zurückgehen), und dann ist *MSF* 58.35 Beweis genug dafür, daß die Tristansage schon zu Veldekes Zeiten dem 'Publikum' bekannt war. Der Satz 'Like Heinrich von Veldeke, he was a Low German, but he wrote in the dialect of the West Rhineland' enthält gleichfalls gleich zwei Ungenauigkeiten: Die Mundart des Braunschweigers Eilhart ist *nieder-sächsisch*, die Veldekes *nieder-fränkisch*; ferner bedient sich der Braunschweiger keines westrheinischen Schriftdialekts, sondern des mittelfränk-

ischen (den ich so wenig ost- wie westrheinisch nennen wurde).<sup>2</sup>— Auch in einer auswahlenden Bibliographie dürfen nicht Titel fehlen wie z. B. die folgenden:

Rottiger, W. *Der heutige Stand der Tristanforschung* 1897.

vKraus, C. Wort und Vers in Gottfrieds Tristan *ZsfA* 51 (1909), 301-378

Jansen, B. *Tristan und Parzival* Utrecht, 1923

Halbach, K. *Gottfried von Straßburg und Konrad von Würzburg* Stuttgart, 1930.

Dafür durfte Will Vespers dummliche Nacherzählung von 1911 ruhig fehlen. Ein Dutzend fataler Druckfehler verbessere ich stillschweigend. (Die Großbuchstaben des Alphabets, die Bogenlagen bezeichnend, sind irritierend, vgl. SS. 37, 133, 181.)

Ich befinde mich in vollem Einverständnis mit Gough, was die Textgestaltung des *Meier Helmbrecht* betrifft (Oxford, 1947), pp. xxxvi, 112. Unter starker Bevorzugung der *Ambraser Hs.* führt er doch einige Male über das von Panzer in *Pauls Altdeutscher* — nicht 'Althochdeutsche,' wie S. xxxiii verdruckt — *Textbibliothek* Geleistete hinaus. Die peinlichste Inkonsistenz in der Normalisierung der Schreibung betrifft *hēt*, dessen Länge bei einem Baiern feststeht, v. 1848 obendrein durch den Reim bewiesen ist. v. 1675 scheint mir mit Hs. B *vich* (·gich) besser als die frisierte Schreibung in A. Der Reim *hūs : ūz* 1709 ist für die Datierung des Gedichts zu wichtig, als daß der Herausgeber stillschweigend hatte darüber hinweggehn dürfen. Die geistesgeschichtliche Einordnung des Gedichts hängt von der Bedeutung ab, die man v. 111 dem Wort *hovescheit* gibt; weder Glossar noch Kommentar gehen mit einem Wort darauf ein. In der Frage von Heimat und Beruf des Verfassers neige ich mehr als zu Gough zu Nordmeyers intelligenter Kritik in *MLQ* viii (1947), 510.

Zum Schluß noch ein Wort vorbehaltloser Empfehlung für W. M. Calders feinfühliges *Selections from Hans Sachs* (Oxford, 1948), pp. vii, 45; die den 'plain text' genau nach Kinzels Ausgabe von 1927 gibt; die sehr vereinzelt Änderungen sind begründet. Auf 45 Seiten ist jeder Genre Sachs'scher Dichtung bestens repräsentiert. Mit einem Ladenpreis von etwa 60 cents ein ideales Büchlein für unsern Universitätsbetrieb.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

<sup>2</sup> Gegenüber älteren Versuchen, Eilharts Sprache als rheinlandisch zu erweisen, vor allem jetzt Cordes, *Zur Sprache Eilharts* (Hamburg, 1939) sowie die Besprechung des Buches im *Anzeiger* 59 (1940), 63 ff.

JOHN MAXWELL'S *SUM REASOWNES AND PROVERBES*

One of the most striking incidental contributions of the late MORRIS P. TILLEY's *Elizabethan Proverb Lore*<sup>1</sup> was his identification of the provenience of the bulk of the sayings in the manuscript of John Maxwell, the younger, of Southbar.<sup>2</sup> The writer in the *Paisley Magazine* had called Maxwell's sayings "perhaps the first collection in Scottish that we have (p. 386), but Tilley demonstrated that "The first one hundred and sixty-nine are from *Petite Pallace*, while the last fifty-two, from number one hundred and eighty-one to the end of the *Manuscript*, are from the first forty pages of *Euphues*"<sup>3</sup> Tilley was unable to identify the sayings numbered 170-180, and remarked that "The eleven proverbs in question, if identified, would tell us what pamphlet, or, possibly, what longer work, Maxwell Younger considered sufficiently important to associate with *Petite Pallace* and *Euphues*."<sup>4</sup> Later on, Tilley wrote that "It is difficult to account for these eleven proverbs that come after the one hundred and sixty-nine quotations from *Petite Pallace* and before the fifty-two from *Euphues*. Maxwell Younger *may* have found them either in the final pages of his

<sup>1</sup> *Elizabethan Proverb Lore in Tyly's Euphues and in Pettr's Petite Pallace*, University of Michigan Publications, Language and Literature, II, New York, 1926

<sup>2</sup> Maxwell's manuscript is described, with representative quotations, in the *Paisley Magazine*, I (1828), 379-386, with references to the section containing the proverbs on pp. 381 and 386. The *Reasownes and proverbes* were printed in the next issue of the *Magazine* (pp. 437-446), and again in William Motherwell's Introductory Essay to Andrew Henderson's *Scottish Proverbs* (Edinburgh, 1832), pp. xxxiv-xliv. Since Motherwell had been editor of the *Paisley Magazine* during the one year of its existence, the connection between the two printings is obvious, and it may well have been Motherwell in whose hands (*Magazine*, p. 381) the manuscript was in 1828. The quotations from the manuscript, whose present whereabouts is unknown to the immediate writer, suggest that it was a common-place book which would seem to deserve more attention than this note professes to give

<sup>3</sup> *Elizabethan Proverb Lore*, p. 6, and see pp. 357-382

<sup>4</sup> P. 6, n. 18. Tilley's consistent use of "Maxwell Younger" as the name of the compiler of the manuscript is apparently due to Henderson, p. xxxiii.



copy of *Petite Pallace* or in the initial pages of his copy of *Euphues*. The sense of the eleven quotations suggests a lost *Apology* by Pettie, printed at the end of his work. We have, however, no evidence that any matter at the end of *Petite Pallace* or at the beginning of *Euphues* has been omitted from the editions of the two books that we know of. They may, of course, be taken from some *short* work not connected with either *Petite Pallace* or *Euphues*.<sup>5</sup>

As a matter of fact, ten (nos. 171-180) of the eleven unidentified sayings were taken from the first fifth of John Rolland's *Seunn Seages*.<sup>6</sup> The *Seunn Seages* was apparently first printed in 1578 and again in 1592 or 1595,<sup>7</sup> and since Maxwell's manuscript was compiled between 1584 and 1589,<sup>8</sup> it is clear that Maxwell used a copy of the first edition.

The following correspondences give first the saying as it was printed in the *Magazine* (p. 445) and second the source in the *Seunn Seages*.

171. Quhen twa argues on force thair talk man be contrair  
Quhen twa arguis, in ane or thay conclude  
On force thair talk mon be contrarious. (P 4, ll 98-99).
172. Neide oft makis wertew.  
And richt weill knawin, that neid oft makis wertew. (P 7, l 159).
173. Ane meik answer slokinnis melancholie  
Ane meik answer slokins Melancolie (P 15, l. 213)
174. Na man suld wirk at thair plesor wtout counsell.  
We may peisaue na Empreour  
Nor King suld wirk at thair plesour  
Without ane gude counsall. (P. 22, ll. 460-462).
175. Nyce is the Nychtingale.  
Nyce is the Nychtingale (P. 31, l 752).
176. It is better to haif ane berde in hand, nor twa in the woode fleande.  
I hard sic a lessoun, better to haue in hand  
A bird in possessioun, nor twa in wod fleand. (P 60, ll 1691-1692).
177. Currage prowokis hardenes  
Cvrage prouokis hardynes (P. 76, l 2212)

---

<sup>5</sup> P. 377.

<sup>6</sup> Ed, Geo F Black, Scottish Text Society, Edinburgh, 1932.

<sup>7</sup> Pp xvi-xvii.

<sup>8</sup> *Paisley Magazine*, p. 381.

- 178 Adwentour gude and half ay gude  
 Auenture gude and haue ay gude, (P 76, l. 2219)
- 179 Set all on adwentour,  
 . . set all on auenture (P 76, l. 2222)
180. Debait makis Destanie  
 for debait makis destanie (P 76, l. 2219)

A clear source of the 170th saying is still lacking. "All erdlie plesure finiseth w<sup>t</sup> wo" represents a sufficiently common sentiment,<sup>9</sup> and the example nearest in phrasing which I have found is Gavin Douglas's "Sen erdlie plesour endis oft with sorrow, we se."<sup>10</sup>

Because the quotations from *Petite Pallace* are taken from the entire work, while those from *Euphues* come only from the first forty pages, Tilley felt that the manuscript might well be incomplete at the end,<sup>11</sup> a suggestion which, obviously on other grounds, had been expressed by the original editor.<sup>12</sup> Maxwell, however, either stopped reading, or ceased to take notes from,<sup>13</sup> the *Seuin Seages* after l. 2219. Why, then, if he closed the *Seuin Seages* far from finished, should we go out of our way to deny him the right to do the same to *Euphues* after forty pages? If it be objected that Maxwell went resolutely through *Petite Pallace*, the rejoinder is evident he read that first and a Scot, even in the sixteenth century, learns by experience

B. J. WHITING

Harvard University

---

<sup>9</sup> It is certainly suggested in the first few lines of the *Seuin Seages* "For wairldlie myrth wald haue sum temperance" (p. 1, l. 9) and "Sum gettis plesure, vthers gettis triay and tene Ze ken the Court can nocht ay stabill stand" (p. 1, ll. 17-18)

<sup>10</sup> "Proloug of the Fyft Buik" of *Eneados*, *Poetical Works of Gavin Douglas*, ed. John Small (4 vols., Edinburgh, 1874), II, 222, l. 12. See also Sir David Lindsay's *Testament of the Papyngo*, *Works*, ed. Douglas Hamer (Scottish Text Society, 4 vols., Edinburgh, 1931-1934), I, 60, ll. 145-147, and G. L. Apperson, *English Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases* (London, 1929), p. 502

<sup>11</sup> P. 6, n. 19

<sup>12</sup> *Paisley Magazine*, pp. 437-438.

<sup>13</sup> Since the poem is rich in proverbs throughout, the first alternative is the more plausible.

A NOTE ON *SAMSON AGONISTES*, LL. 90-94

In the course of his complaint about his blindness, Samson asks why the sight was confined to the eyes. Why is it not, like the soul, whole in every part of the body or, like the feeling, diffused through all parts?

Since light so necessary is to life,  
And almost life itself, if it be true  
That light is in the Soul,  
She all in every part, why was the sight  
To such a tender ball as th'eye confin'd?<sup>1</sup>

So far as I have noted, no one has called attention to the psychological commonplace alluded to in these lines. One of the questions dealt with in all treatments of the soul is its location, whether in one special organ, as the heart or the liver, or in the whole body, and if in the whole body whether one part of the soul informed the head, another the heart, and so on. Aristotle had hinted that, if the soul had parts, then each part of the body was informed by a part of the soul.<sup>2</sup>

This hint was not satisfactory, and there grew up early in the development of Christian psychology a formula which preserved the indivisibility of the soul, it is whole in the whole body and whole in every part of the body—"she all in every part."<sup>3</sup>

ARNOLD WILLIAMS

*Michigan State College*

---

<sup>1</sup> *Samson Agonistes* (Columbia ed.), ll 90-94

<sup>2</sup> *De Anima*, II, i (412b-413a).

<sup>3</sup> One could probably collect a hundred repetitions of this formula in the fathers, in the scholastics, and in Renaissance authors who treat, either in Latin or in the vernacular, the soul. The following are but a few of possible citations

Nam ideo simplicior [anima] est corpore, quia non mole diffunditur per spatium loci, sed in unoquoque corpore, et in toto tota est, et in qualibet ejus parte tota est. [Augustine, *De Trinitate*, VI, 6 (*Migne Patrologia Latina*, XXXIII, 722)] Per eadem autem ostendi potest animam totam in toto corpore esse et totam in singulis partibus [Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, II, LXXII (Vivès ed. XII, 193); also *Summa Theologica*, I, LXXVI, 8 (Vivès ed., I, 473)], Anima est tota in toto, et in qualibet parte

## MILTON'S AID TO DAVENANT

Anthony Wood says that when Davenant was captured by Parliament ships in 1650 and imprisoned "to be tried for his life," he was saved chiefly by Milton.<sup>1</sup> Recent Davenant biographers, knowing that Davenant had other aid and seeing no way for Milton to help, question the reliability of Wood's statement.<sup>2</sup> The evidence ought to be reconsidered, however.

Wood's information came from the anonymous biography of Milton, which does not give a date or say that Milton saved Davenant's life. It says only that Milton befriended many, among them "Sr William Davenant when taken Prisoner, for . . . whom he *procured relief*."<sup>3</sup> William Davenant Jr., whom Milton tutored perhaps as early as 1666, told old Jacob Tsonson a strikingly similar story: "That when his father was in the tower he was *very much assisted* by Mr. Milton in his *gaining his Liberty*. . . ."<sup>4</sup> The question then is not whether Milton saved Davenant's life, but how he might have helped him.

There was no trial for his life, but Davenant's imprisonment dragged on through many false hopes and just grievances. On March 20, 1653/4, he sent a petition to Cromwell, reviewing his

tota. Quod unde sumptum [hoc dictum] sit ignoro. Nam in Aristotele nusquam extat [Phillip Melancthon, *Liber de Anima in Opera*, ed. C. G. Bretschneider (Halle, 1846), XIII, 18-19.] So doth the piercing Soul, the Body fill Being all in all, and all in part diffused . . . [Sir John Davies, *Nosce Teipsum* (stanza 230), in A. H. Bullen, *Some Longer Elizabethan Poems* (Westminster, 1903), p. 74] . . . and as God is wholly in every part of the world, so is the soul of man wholly in every part of the body. 'Anima est tota in toto, et tota in qualibet parte,' the soul is wholly in the whole body, and wholly in every part thereof, according to Aristotle . . . [Sir Walter Raleigh, *History of the World*, I, II, I in *Works* (Edinburgh, 1826), I, 49 Raleigh had been misled by a marginal citation in his source, Pererius, into crediting this opinion to Aristotle]

<sup>1</sup> *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. Philip Bliss (1813), III, 805.

<sup>2</sup> Alfred Harbage, *Sir William Davenant* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1935), p. 115. See also Arthur H. Nethercot, *Sir William Davenant* (University of Chicago Press, 1938), pp. 281 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *The Early Lives of Milton*, ed. Helen Darbishire (London: Constable & Co., 1932), p. 30. Italics mine.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 338. Italics mine.

wrongs and begging "freedom from writs, protection during the dependence of my case, and liberty to live obediently in my native country. . . ." <sup>5</sup> The Protector referred the case to the Council. On April 18th the Council reviewed the case and turned the whole matter over to a committee composed of Colonels Sydenham, Mackworth, and Montague, Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, and Mr Strickland <sup>6</sup> Here were men whom Milton could approach, for he often sat with them in the Council chambers. Furthermore, Sydenham, Montague, and Strickland were signalled out for special praise in the *Defensio Secunda*, which appeared in May.<sup>7</sup> On June 27th the committee ordered that Davenant be set at liberty and a pardon prepared, and on August 4th a warrant was issued for his official release from the Tower.<sup>8</sup>

If, as we have good reason to believe, Milton did exert himself for his fellow poet, he probably acted through this committee. Certainly it was in this way that he could best have "procured relief" for him, or "very much assisted" him in "gaining his liberty."

W. ARTHUR TURNER

Oberlin College

#### THE ANNOTATIONS IN MILTON'S FAMILY BIBLE

In 1938, the annotations in Milton's family Bible (MS. Add. 32,310) were twice listed and discussed: in an article <sup>1</sup> and in volume XVIII of the *Columbia Milton*.<sup>2</sup> Neither of these accounts, however, is exhaustive; and one is not completely accurate. As a contribution, then, to a fuller description of these annotations, I offer the following additions to the *Columbia* text and notes: <sup>3</sup>

<sup>5</sup> *CSPD*, 1654, p 106

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid*, pp 107-8

<sup>7</sup> *Columbia Works*, VIII, 235

<sup>8</sup> *CSPD*, 1654, pp 224, 439

<sup>1</sup> *PMLA*, LII (1938), 363-66

<sup>2</sup> *The Works of John Milton*, New York, XVIII (1938), 274-75, 559-61

<sup>3</sup> Further study of Milton's Bible will probably reveal additional annotations that I, like my predecessors, have overlooked. The volume is thick, the ink sometimes faint, and the marks often small and not easily noticed. Text. p 274. 3a. In Proverbs iv, 5, "youth" deleted and "mouth." written immediately after the deletion.

Notes pp 559-61

- I *Verses Underlined* 2 Chronicles 14 1; Esther 1 8, Psalms 108 13
- II. *Symbols of Attention in Margins*
  - 1 "NB" IN MARGIN 2 Chronicles 14 1, the Columbia citation of 2 Chronicles 19 26, 27 is an error, as the chapter contains only 11 verses, Jeremiah 29 11
  2. "KJ" IN MARGIN Ezra 3 13, Esther 2 20, Job 7 20, Psalms 108 13, Jeremiah 29 13
  3. "+" IN MARGIN 1 Chronicles 10 13, Psalms 103, 3, 4, 6, Lamentations 3 12
  - 4 MISCELLANEOUS MARKS 1 Chronicles 10 14, Job 27. 8, 9, Psalms 60 11, 76 9, 83 18, the Columbia citation of Psalms 96 12, 13 is incorrect, as the verses show no marks, Jeremiah 33 3, Ecclesiasticus 7 20.
  - 5 PASSAGES BRACKETED 2 Chronicles 25. 16, 20, the Columbia citation of Psalms 94 12, 13 is not accurate, for the marks do not constitute a bracket but rather a series of dots and three letters "J<sup>1</sup>K (?) " and could better be classified under 4, Miscellaneous Marks, Jeremiah 29 11
- IV *Holes Burned through Pages* Genesis 23; Proverbs 1, the Columbia citation of Matthew 3 is not accurate, for the hole is repaired, as the Columbia citation of Matthew 3 57, under VI, indicates.
- VI. *Holes Patched and Restored with Handwriting* leaf F [p 35], John 19. 4-5.

MAURICE KELLEY

*Princeton University*

### "SHAKESPEARE PAYS SOME COMPLIMENTS"

Listed in iv, v, 13-15 of *Richard III* are the names of nobles who fought well against the tyrant; only five of the six are found in Holinshed. The exception is the Earl of Pembroke. A Sir James Blunt is also mentioned in this scene. In v, iii, however, this doughty Captain within the space of fourteen lines (30-43) is cited no less than three times. Turning to Holinshed, we find that the title has been furnished him by Shakespeare. In the source he is simply "James Blunt, capteine of the . . . fortresse . . . of Calais."<sup>1</sup> Now the Blunts were one of the wealthy land-owning families of Stratford who were related by marriage to the Combes, the family with whom the poet was intimate. In the will of John Combe, wherein a bequest was left the poet, we find a Sir Edward

<sup>1</sup> Everyman Ed., pp. 166-67.

Blunt named as one of the executors.<sup>2</sup> Interestingly enough the Blunts were knighted in 1588. In the light of these facts is it not warranted to assume that the Young Shakespeare was paying pretty compliments to the descendents of families known personally to him?

SIDNEY SHANKER

*University of North Carolina*

---

### SHAKESPEARE'S SONNET NO. 8

The first thirteen lines elaborate a comparison between the friend and music. Himself the embodiment of music, he does not want to hear it although he really loves it. Music, a "true concord of well-tuned sounds", chides him because he destroys by being single (1. unmarried; 2. a single note) the harmony he should make (To sing or play one part in an ensemble is to bear a part). Music is harmony; the strings struck simultaneously produce a single note, the union of many sounds. In this they resemble a family, which is a unity made up of sire, child, and mother. The sonnet concludes:

Whose speechless song, being many, seeming one,  
Sings this to the. 'Thou single wilt prove none'

There are two interpretations of the last sentence. Tyler's, "Thou canst give forth no harmony, and must eventually cease altogether"; and Dowden's, "Perhaps an allusion to the proverbial expression that one is no number. Compare Sonnet cxxxvi 'Among a number one is reckon'd none'". Dowden seems to have been followed by all the remaining editors. However, both readings are unsatisfactory. To assume, as does Dowden, a shift in the last line to a mathematical metaphor is to destroy the unity of the poem, a unity like that of other sonnets built on a single image. Such sonnets are exceptional, but they exist and are aesthetically satisfying, whereas a sonnet built on two images in the proportion of thirteen to one would be unique as well as an aesthetic monstrosity.

The last line is the culmination of the musical image, an idea that Tyler seems only partially to have grasped. A chord, being in

<sup>2</sup> *William Shakespeare: Facts & Problems*, E. K. Chambers (Oxford, 1930), 11, 137.

reality many sounds, although it seems only one, warns the friend that if he remains unmarried, a single string sounded alone, he will prove to be no true music.

THEODORE H. BANKS

*Wesleyan University*

### AN ENGLISH SOURCE FOR ONE OF MORE'S LATIN EPIGRAMS

A contemporary English version, apparently unnoted, of a Latin epigram of Sir Thomas More entitled "In amicam foedifragam iocosum, versum e cantione anglica," appears in a Tudor manuscript songbook, the Fairfax Manuscript (Br. Mus. Add. Ms. 5654):<sup>1</sup>

Benedicite what dremyd I this nyzt  
me thought the worlde was turnyd vp so downe  
the son the moone had lost ther force and lyzt  
the see also drownyd both towie and towne  
yett more mervell how that I hard the sownde  
of onys voice sayyng here In thy mynd  
thi lady hath forgoten to be kynd.

More's Latin rendering is as follows:

Dij melius, uenere mihi hac quae somnia nocte?  
Tota semel mundi machina uersa ruit  
Nec sua lux Phoebo constabat, nec sua Phoebe  
Iamque tumens omnem strauerat aequor humum  
Maus adhuc miuum, uox en mihi dicere uisa est,  
Heus tua iam pactam fregit amica fidem.

ANDREW J. SABOL

*Brown University*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Bernhard Fehr, ed., "Die Lieder des Fairfax MS," *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, v. 106, 1901, p. 55. The English version, as well as the musical setting for three voices, is anonymous.



A BOETHIAN PARALLEL TO *F. Q.* I, II, 1, 2-4

Though Todd has pointed out that the "northerne wagoner" of *F. Q.*, I, II, 1, 1, is Bootes, no editor has indicated that the following reference to

". . . the stedfast starre,  
That was in Ocean Waues yet neuer wet, ,  
But firme & fixt, . . ."

perpetuates a poetic conception of the pole star and its associated constellation which was memorably stated in Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, Book IV, Metrum VI, *Si vis Celsi iura*. In Chaucer's translation the passage reads;

Ne the sterre yclepid the Bere, that enclyneth his ravysschyng cours  
abowte the sovereyn heighte of the world—ne the same sterre Ursa  
nis nevere mo wasschen in the depe westrene see, ne coveyteth nat to deeyen  
his flaumes in the see of the occian, although it see othere sterres  
iplowngid in the see.<sup>1</sup>

MERRITT Y HUGHES

*University of Wisconsin*

## CONTEMPORARY DEFENSE OF WORDSWORTH'S "PEDLAR"

Of the critical questions arising out of consideration of Wordsworth's *Excursion*, one that interested contemporary reviewers was the propriety of casting one of the interlocutors as a *pedlar*. This question received the differing attentions of no less persons than Charles Lamb and Francis Jeffrey, and was a substantial factor in determining the reception of the poem.

Charles Lamb in the *Quarterly Review* first spoke directly on this subject: "One objection it is impossible not to foresee. It will be asked, why put such eloquent discourse in the mouth of a pedlar?"<sup>1</sup> Lamb answered in terms of Wordsworth's philosophy and the setting of the poem, and suggested that any who were offended by the word *pedlar* could "substitute silently the word

<sup>1</sup> *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, edited by F. N. Robinson. Boston, 1933 P. 433.

<sup>2</sup> *Quarterly Review*, XII (1814), 111.

*Palmer*, or *Pilgrim*, or any less offensive designation,"<sup>2</sup> if that were necessary to enable them to enjoy the poem.

That Lamb fore-saw clearly, the *Edinburgh Review* demonstrated the next month. Francis Jeffrey began, "This will never do," and mounted to a climax of exasperation in his remarks on the occupation of the pedlar.

Why should Mr Wordsworth have made his hero a superannuated Pedlar? What but the most wretched and provoking perversity of taste and judgment, could induce any one to place his chosen advocate of wisdom and virtue in so absurd and fantastic a condition?<sup>3</sup>

Among sarcasms about higgling over brass buttons and selling flannel, Jeffrey exclaimed:

. . . is it not plain that, independent of the ridicule and disgust which such a personification must give to many of his readers, its adoption exposes his work throughout to the charge of revolting incongruity, and utter disregard of probability or nature?<sup>4</sup>

The *Eclectic Review*, an organ of dissenters, spoke from a background different from that of the aristocratic Scottish gentleman, and to different effect: "It was one of the most daring experiments in modern poetry, to make a *quondam* Pedlar the hero of 'a literary work, that might live;' and we will venture to say it has been one of the most successful."<sup>5</sup> "Moral and intellectual dignity," the *Eclectic* maintained, "the God of Nature . . . bestows on select individuals . . . scattered through every walk of life."<sup>6</sup> This reviewer did not find the philosophical pedlar literally plausible. "But if this paragon have no prototype in individual man, it has perfect ideal existence, and therefore poetical reality. It resembles Nature as the Belvidere Apollo, and the Venus de Medici resemble her. . . ."<sup>7</sup> The *British Critic*, a high church journal, also voiced a democratic reaction to the pedlar, though a less vehement one than the dissenting *Eclectic*. Said the *British Critic*.

We could almost wish, not for our own pleasure, but to avoid scandalizing such as feel by rule, that our author had given a being thus educated

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>3</sup> *Edinburgh Review*, XXIV (1814), 29-30.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, p. 30.

<sup>5</sup> *Eclectic Review*, n. s. III (1815), 26.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 29.

some higher employment. . . . And certainly, they who feel no delight in the sublimities of this man's song . . . merely because he is called a pedlar, must needs be the slaves of names to an extraordinary degree, and that is a kind of service not very manly nor very philosophical.<sup>8</sup>

Take that, Mr. Jeffrey. There is more to come.

The *British Review and London Critical Journal*, a few years later publicized by Lord Byron as "my Grandmother's Review," replied to Jeffrey's *Edinburgh* review in the most personal terms. Talk of flannels and buttons is easy ridicule, said the *British Review*, but those who know our mountaineers would show more respect. Also, even if the pedlar were improbable, the poet "would have a perfect right to suppose such a character."<sup>9</sup> In short.

It is an arrogant ignorance of the nature of the human mind that ventures thus to prescribe to the poet the probabilities of character. . . . The whole process of mind in this intelligent mountaineer is, in fact, traced by Mr. Wordsworth with beautiful consistency and truth.<sup>10</sup>

ALFRED C. AMES

*Illinois Institute of Technology*

---

### HAWTHORNE'S USE OF A PATTERN FROM *THE RAMBLER*

Five sketches in Hawthorne's *Mosses*—"A Select Party," "The Hall of Fantasy," "The Christmas Banquet," "The Intelligence Office," and "A Virtuoso's Collection"—show similarity of design but differ radically in this aspect of their artistry from their companion pieces. Each has a brief introduction and conclusion separated by a somewhat extended section enumerating objects in catalog fashion or presenting a pageant of individual figures who pass in somewhat rapid succession. Newton Arvin disposes of the sketches in a lump, except for "The Christmas Banquet," as the "veriest bagatelles," which give "the impression of high, uncommon energy being dissipated in the service of cheap and silly ends."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>8</sup> *British Critic*, XLV (1815), 457-458.

<sup>9</sup> *British Review and London Critical Journal*, VI (1815), 57-58.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 58

<sup>1</sup> *Hawthorne* (Boston, 1929), pp. 125-126. Cf. G. E. Woodberry, *Nathaniel Hawthorne* (Boston and New York, 1902), p. 121, who speaks of "A Virtuoso's Collection" as having "a peculiar character, being no more than a play of fancy, a curiosity of literary invention."

Mrs. Alice L. Cooke has demonstrated that for two of the pieces, "A Select Party" and "The Hall of Fantasy," Hawthorne was much indebted to Swift.<sup>2</sup> For general structure, however, all probably proceed from his acquaintance with a few issues of Dr Johnson's *Rambler* of similar design. Several of Johnson's essays display such pattern,<sup>3</sup> and there is reason to believe that the author of *Mosses* was familiar with Numbers 82 and 105 of the *Rambler*,<sup>4</sup> in particular, and drew upon them for "A Virtuoso's Collection" and "The Intelligence Office."

Though Hawthorne confesses never "caring much about any of the stalwart Doctor's grandiloquent productions except his two stern and masculine poems 'London' and 'The Vanity of Human Wishes,'" <sup>5</sup> there is evidence that he had handled *The Lives of the Poets*<sup>6</sup> and *Rasselas*.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, we have his own statement concerning his early acquaintance with Boswell's *Life*<sup>8</sup> and his tributes to Johnson in *Biographical Stories*<sup>9</sup> and in *Our Old Home*,<sup>10</sup> as well as copious expression in *The English Notebooks*,<sup>11</sup> to testify to his fondness for Johnson the man.

Whether or not he ever read extensively in the Doctor's journalistic writings, his attention must have been attracted in Boswell to the expression concerning the *Rambler*, "No. 82, a Virtuoso who has collected curiosities,"<sup>12</sup> and his interest challenged to know the content. Not many pages beyond this paper he would have come upon one about the Universal Register. Little need be said of the

<sup>2</sup> "Some Evidences of Hawthorne's Indebtedness to Swift," *Studies in English*, the University of Texas Bulletin, No. 18 (1938), pp. 140-162.

<sup>3</sup> *The Works of Samuel Johnson with an Essay on His Life and Genius* by Arthur Murray, Esq. (New York, 1837), I, 131, 165, 317, 320.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 131, 165.

<sup>5</sup> *The Complete Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne*, Wayside ed. (Boston and New York, 1902), VII, 150.

<sup>6</sup> *The Essex Institute Historical Collections*, LXVIII (January, 1932), 67.

<sup>7</sup> Arlin Turner, *Hawthorne as Editor* (Louisiana State University Press, 1941), p. 199.

<sup>8</sup> *The Complete Works*, VII, 149.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, XII, 166-171.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, VII, 160-168.

<sup>11</sup> *The English Notebooks by Nathaniel Hawthorne*, ed. Randall Stewart (New York and London, 1941), pp. 101, 148, 149, 152, 153, 223, 252, 281, 293, 327, 369, 515, 542, 555, 598.

<sup>12</sup> James Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.*, Everyman ed. (London and New York, 1910), I, 128.

relationship of Hawthorne's "A Virtuoso's Collection" to the first of these, as it is quite obvious.<sup>13</sup> Though point of view, approach, and theme are different, each has a central section consisting of a catalog of a strange assortment of objects, and each reveals a virtuoso devoid of human sympathy.<sup>14</sup> *Rambler*, No. 105, takes the form of a vision, in which the observer, subsequent to a period of meditation, is brought in dream to a palace in which Justice and Truth, respectively, investigate and record in a Universal Register the desires of men. The allegorical figure Curiosity identifies the place for the dreamer, indicates the functions of the two operators, and then, in company with the dreamer, observes and listens as a number of men present singly their complaints and wishes. The sleeper is at length awakened as a question is put to him. Hawthorne's "The Intelligence Office," though not a dream vision, follows the tripartite pattern and presents a number of men who appear in turn—here, before the single intelligence officer—to relate their wishes, desires, complaints. Johnson makes Truth the recorder, Hawthorne has Truth sought by the last of the petitioners. What Curiosity points out as the activities of Justice and Truth applies as well to the operator of the Intelligence Office.

. . . to register the demands and pretensions of mankind, that the world may at last be reduced to order, and that none may complain hereafter of being doomed to tasks for which they are unqualified, of possessing faculties for which they cannot find employment, of virtues that languish unobserved for want of opportunities to exert them, of being encumbered with superfluities which they would willingly resign, or of wasting away in desires which ought to be satisfied<sup>15</sup>

Hawthorne preserves his own philosophic point of view. Whereas Johnson's applicants are all impostors, conniving to prey upon the public, some of Hawthorne's have had their bitter experience and are remorseful. Hawthorne stresses the indefiniteness and transiency of men's desires and their mistaken sense of values; Johnson emphasizes the knavery.

<sup>13</sup> One paper of *The Tatler*, No. 216 deals with a virtuoso and some of his collection, but it is not so evidently a source for "A Virtuoso's Collection" as is *The Rambler*.

<sup>14</sup> Hawthorne's interest in Johnson's fear of death (cf. *The Complete Works*, VII, 150) may have prompted the scene in "A Virtuoso's Collection" in which the author declines the offer of earthly immortality.

<sup>15</sup> *The Works of Samuel Johnson*, I, 166.

In the five sketches mentioned at the beginning of this note Hawthorne employs the pattern on which the two sketches from the *Rambler* are built; for "The Virtuoso's Collection" and "The Intelligence Office" he seems to have borrowed also pertinent suggestions for content.

FRANK DAVIDSON

*Indiana University*

---

"DOOM IS DARK AND DEEPER THAN ANY  
SEA-DINGLE"

W. H. Auden and *Sawles Warde*

That W. H. Auden has been much influenced by medieval, especially English, literature must be obvious to any reader of his work.<sup>1</sup> His great reliance on alliteration, his diction and his imagery, all bear out his own statement, "The three greatest influences on my own work have been, I think, Dante, Langland [and Pope]."<sup>2</sup> In the hope of providing an exact example of that influence and of elucidating one of the poet's most popular and difficult poems, "Doom is Dark and Deeper than any Sea-Dingle," I wish to call attention to the Middle English source of this striking opening line.<sup>3</sup>

This short poem appeared in Auden's first published collection of his work entitled *Poems* in 1930, when the influence of his Oxford days must still have been strong upon him. He had graduated from that University in 1928 after having read in English literature and the social sciences. Shortly thereafter, in the same year, he left for Berlin. The English school at Oxford would certainly have weighted its reading requirements heavily in favor of the early period. Auden has described his University days as follows:

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Henry W. Wells, *New Poets from Old*, New York, (1940), 48 ff., 66 ff., 196 etc. Mr. Auden's latest work, *Age of Anxiety*, New York (1947), is written entirely in the alliterative style.

I wish to render here my thanks to Mr. Ephim G. Fogel for various suggestions which I have used in this paper.

<sup>2</sup> "Criticism in a Mass Society," *The Intent of the Critic* by Edmund Wilson, Norman Foerster, John Crowe Ransom and W. H. Auden, ed. with an Introduction by Donald A. Stauffer (1941), 132.

<sup>3</sup> In the recent collected edition of Auden's poems, New York, 1945 (pp. 34-35) "Doom is Dark" is called "Something is Bound to Happen." Previously it bore no definite title.

All youth's intolerant certainty was mine as  
 I faced life in a double-breasted suit,  
 I bought and praised but did not read Aquinas,  
 At the *Criterion's* verdict I was mute,  
 Though Arnold's I was ready to refute,  
 And through the quads dogmatic words rang clear,  
 'Good poetry is classic and austere.'<sup>4</sup>

The source of Auden's opening line in "Doom is Dark" is to be found in the alliterative prose West Midland homily, *Sawles Warde*, one of the so-called Katherine group of texts concerned with religious subjects, dated early thirteenth century by its latest editor.<sup>5</sup> It is a loose and much expanded version of chapters XIII-XV of the fourth book of Hugh of St. Victor's *De Anima*, a work which employs allegory and figurative language in a manner characteristic of the author.

The Middle English homily, taking the suggestion from its source, is based on the common medieval symbolic figure of man as a castle. Here the father or master of the house is Wit (reason or intelligence),<sup>6</sup> and his wife is an unruly female called Will.<sup>7</sup> Their servants are the five senses. Wit has as supporters four daughters of the Lord, the four cardinal virtues, Prudence, (Spiritual) Strength, Moderation and Righteousness. These five attempt to keep Madame Will in check but, since the servants tend to side with the mistress, things are rather difficult. When Wit leaves the house, the servants cannot be relied upon to guard it. "But it behoveth not that this house be robbed, for there is therein the treasure that God gave himself for, that is, man's soul. For to break this house for this treasure that God redeemed with his death. . . ." <sup>8</sup>

<sup>4</sup> See W. H. Auden and Louis MacNeice, *Letters from Iceland*, London (1937), 209.

<sup>5</sup> R. M. Wilson, *Sawles Warde, An Early Middle English Homily Edited from the Bodley, Royal and Cotton MSS* (Leeds School of English Language Texts and Monographs III [1938]), pp xxxviii-xxxix.

<sup>6</sup> Translates the Latin *animus*.

<sup>7</sup> Will is not found in *De Anima* and is probably the creation of the English homilist, who is however following tradition in setting Wit against Will.

<sup>8</sup> A modified version of Richard Morris' translation of *Sawles Warde* in *Old English Homilies*, First Series, *EETS*, 34 (1868), 246. The second sentence here which I leave incomplete is badly constructed in the original and would hardly qualify as a complete sentence in modern English. The remainder not printed here is, however, of no importance to my argument.

Then two visitors arrive, one after the other, at the house: Fear of Death who regales the household with a description of hell much expanded from the original, and Love of Life who tells its inmates of the joys of heaven. In the course of this latter description, Love of Life speaks of the delights enjoyed by those who dwell in God's sight. "They are so wise that they know all God's counsels, his mysteries, and his dooms [judgments] which are secret and deeper than any sea dingle." (Ha beoð se wise þat ha witen alle godes reades. his runes *ant* his domes þe derne beoð *ant* deopre þen eni sea dingle).<sup>9</sup> The four daughters, after this, suggest to Fear of Death that he depart as long as Love of Life is present. After he leaves, protesting, Dame Will and the servants are at last quiet and submit themselves to their natural master, Wit. The sermon concludes with a brief *significatio*, emphasizing that man should obey Wit, his master, and keep Will in her place with the help of the four sisters.

Professor Wilson in his edition of the homily points out that "sea-dingle" translates or stands for Hugo's term *abyssus* and that the word does not appear again in English literature until Drayton uses it. The word "dingle" is of doubtful etymology and is found in a few place names in the west of England.<sup>10</sup>

There can be no doubt that Auden is echoing this striking Middle English sentence in his poem. The phrasing, the rhythm and the extreme rarity of the word "dingle" make that clear. He has, however, changed the obsolete "derne" (secret) to "dark" and has put "domes" into the singular number. Doom also has a different connotation and force in Modern English than in Middle English. The differences in meaning are, however, slight, and he has preserved the effective *d* alliteration and has improved the assonance, giving us two back vowels in the two main words in the first half of the line to balance the three front ones in *deeper, sea* and *dingle*.

Will a knowledge of Auden's source here help to elucidate the meaning of his poem? That such knowledge makes clear that the doom in the first line comes from God cannot be questioned. What

<sup>9</sup> I have used Morris' translation, p. 262 (see preceding note) and his text (p. 263) here. The three MSS. as may be seen in Wilson's edition, pp. 34-35 (lines 318-320) present variations at this point, but they are of no significance to our purpose. MS. Royal 17.A 27, however, drops the word "domes."

<sup>10</sup> See Wilson, *op cit.*, pp 74-75.



about the rest of the poem? There are a number of obvious parallels. In both poem and sermon, a house, its master, a feminine household<sup>11</sup> and the fact of the master's leaving the house are all referred to. The general circumstances under which "Doom is Dark" was written, particularly the date of its composition, would make it at least possible that Auden, who had probably read the *Sawles Warde* for his Oxford tutor, could have used with conscious purpose this Middle English work.

On the other hand, the differences between the two works are striking. The emphasis in each is different. In the homily, the preacher is interested primarily in the house and its inmates and rarely does he leave this subject. In the poem, however, the emphasis is rather on the journey of the man, and the hope is expressed that he may return safely from his dangers. (Still Mr. Auden prays that the house too may be protected). The details of the poem, moreover, the "day-wishing flowers," the "undried sea," the "unquiet bed," the "kissing of wife under single sheet," the "sudden tiger's spring at corner" need to be carefully examined for their own meanings, for it is certain that *Sawles Warde* provides no help in interpreting these phrases.

The poem, moreover, suggests, in general, a Greek, not a Christian, conception of fate. Auden once used the title "Chorus" for it which further strengthens that feeling. Hence we must hesitate before attempting to read into "Doom is Dark" an allegory of reason deserting man or some such interpretation. It does seem, however, that house, master, women and the departure from a house were part of the apperceptive mass which clung to Auden's memory of his opening line. It has been said of Auden that "his magpie brain [is] a horde of curious and suggestive phrases."<sup>12</sup> In that horde clustered around the homilist's phrase these associated ideas could very well have lingered, and when the mysterious forces that engender creation set to work, these ideas may have arisen to be used as the author saw fit. Out of the alembic came a poem far from the spirit of *Sawles Warde*, but still bearing upon it signs of Auden's earlier reading and studying. The poet's interest in Middle English literature which comes out in full force in his recent *Age of Anxiety*

<sup>11</sup> "No cloud-soft hand can hold him, restraint by women"

<sup>12</sup> Christopher Isherwood speaking of Auden under the thin disguise of Hugh Weston in *Leons and Shadows, An Education in the Twenties*, London (1938), 191.

is no new phenomenon, and remembering that Auden nosed "among Saxon skulls, roots of our genealogies"<sup>13</sup> will aid us in the fuller comprehension of the body of his poetry and of his methods of composing, just as it surely provides us with the source of the line "Doom is dark and deeper than any sea-dingle."

MORTON W. BLOOMFIELD

*The Ohio State University*

---

### A NOTE ON JOYCE AND YEATS

Many of James Joyce's references in *Ulysses* to specific persons, places, and events have been listed, and readers have been shocked or delighted by Joyce's sardonic comments on Irish literary men, especially in the scene in the library, but one satirical allusion to Yeats has not been noted. In the opening of *Ulysses*, Buck Mulligan at breakfast in the tower gives Haines, the Englishman, a sample of peasant talk and adds,

—That's folk . . . for your book, Haines Five lines of text and ten pages of notes about the folk and fishgods of Dundrum. Printed by the weird sisters in the year of the big wind<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Richard M. Kain recently quoted this passage as an example of Mulligan's "genial ridicule of Haines's interest in folklore."<sup>2</sup> Actually, the passage refers directly and sharply to Yeats's volume, *In the Seven Woods*, published in 1903, eleven months before the supposed time of the events of *Ulysses*, June, 1904. The colophon of Yeats's book reads:

Here ends *In the Seven Woods*, written by William Butler Yeats, printed, upon paper made in Ireland, and published by Elizabeth Corbet Yeats at the Dun Emer Press, in the house of Evelyn Gleeson at Dundrum in the county of Dublin, Ireland, finished the sixteenth day of July, in the year of the big wind, 1903.

---

<sup>13</sup> See "Letter to W. H. Auden," C. Day Lewis, *Collected Poems 1929-1933*, New York (1935), 101.

<sup>1</sup> James Joyce, *Ulysses* (New York, 1934), p. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Richard M. Kain, *Fabulous Voyager* (Chicago, 1947), pp. 103-4.

The fact that Yeats had annotated elaborately several volumes of his early verse makes Mulligan's "Five lines of text and ten pages of notes" applicable to Yeats, and the place Dundrum, the press run by Yeats's sister and another woman (Mulligan's "weird sisters"), and the date "in the year of the big wind" make clear that Joyce was aiming, or causing Mulligan to aim, not only at what he thought the absurdities of the Irish folklorists in general but at Yeats in particular.

Two of Yeats's comments on *Ulysses*, which he read in 1922 with profound admiration, perhaps best describe Joyce's hard personal thrusts, for Yeats found in the book, he said, "our Irish cruelty, also our kind of strength"; and he felt, too, in the Martello tower scenes, Joyce's "cruel playful mind like a great soft tiger cat."<sup>3</sup>

MARION WITT

Hunter College

---

## REVIEWS

---

*Novalis' Hymnen an die Nacht, zur Deutung und Datierung.* Von H. KAMLA, Copenhagen, Munksgaard, 1945. iv, 200 pp.

*Novalis et la pensée mystique.* Par MAURICE BESSET, Paris, Aubier, 1947. 197 pp.

*Der Mythos der Musik in Novalis' Heinrich von Ofterdingen.* Von A. J. M. BUS, Alkmaar, Herms. Coster & Zoon, 1947. (Diss., Amsterdam). 165 pp.

In 1921 Paul Kluckhohn and Richard Samuel published their edition of Novalis' *Schriften* in four volumes (Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut). This edition was the fruit of over sixty years of Novalis scholarship and, in turn, provided the starting point for further research. The writings of Novalis, perhaps more than the writings of any other author, pose extremely difficult questions of textual criticism and exegesis. It was therefore particularly regrettable when the projected textual and explanatory notes had to be omitted from the Kluckhohn-Samuel edition.

The date and genesis of the *Hymnen an die Nacht* is among the editorial cruces. They were first published in 1800 in the *Athenaeum* ("A"); by and large, scholars inclined to see in them the

<sup>3</sup> Quoted by Joseph Hone, *W. B. Yeats* (New York, 1943), p. 371.

more or less immediate expression of the poet's reaction to the death, in March, 1797, of Sophie, his fiancée. Then an earlier manuscript version ("h") became known and was published by Heilborn in his edition of 1901. Since then, 1799 has often been suggested as a more likely date for the *Hymnen*; there was, for example, a possible influence of Schleiermacher's *Reden* which did not appear until 1799; or again R. Unger suggested a possible influence of Herder's *Paramythien* which Novalis read in 1799. 1799 seemed finally established as the year of composition when Kluckhohn in his edition, on graphological evidence, proved this year to be the date of the manuscript version (h) which was considered the poet's actual first draft.

In 1930 H. Ritter<sup>1</sup> re-examined the manuscript (h) in order to find a definitive textual basis for his interpretation of the hymns. He was not primarily concerned with the question of date. His minute analysis of the manuscript led him to new conclusions: the first part of the manuscript, containing hymns 1-4, was *not* a first draft but rather had to be considered a copy of an earlier lost version ("x").<sup>2</sup> He suggested 1797 as the date of x, which was copied in 1799 when the remaining parts were composed (h); the whole was then revised for publication in the *Athenaeum* (A). This, of course, opened the question of how far the hymns were conceived and executed as a unified poem (or cycle of poems).

H. Kamla starts, so to speak, where Ritter had left off. With some modification his is an attempt to substantiate Ritter's dating and to supply the proof. The great value of Kamla's study is his scholarly, careful, critical review of all available evidence and his re-examination of theories, deductions, hypotheses of earlier scholars. He comes to the conclusion that x (1797) must have contained hymns 1-3 and what in h is the second (verse) part of hymn 4. He seeks to support the later composition of hymns 5, 6, and the first (prose) part of hymn 4 by two major, new considerations. First, he sees in these later parts a conscious and intentional rejection of the this-worldly classicism of Weimar; and, mainly by analyzing Novalis' critique of Goethe's *Meister*, Kamla attempts to show that the opposition to the spirit (not to the art) of Weimar did not crystallize in Novalis until 1799. Secondly, Kamla maintains that the central ideas of the fifth hymn were possible only after the correspondence with F. Schlegel between November, 1798, and March, 1799; for, on December 2, 1798, Schlegel had expounded his "Gedanken von Religion und Bibel" and had referred to Lessing, and Novalis had answered that most

<sup>1</sup> H. Ritter, *Novalis' Hymnen an die Nacht, ihre Deutung nach dem Inhalt und Aufbau auf textkritischer Grundlage* Heidelberg, 1930 (Beitr. z. neueren Litg., N F. 13)

<sup>2</sup> The probability of the existence of x was further enhanced by a statement of Novalis' brother, Karl, which R. Samuel quoted in his review of Ritter, *DLZ* LI (1930), 1372 sqq.

of it had remained to him "kimmerisch dunkel", if Kamla's interpretation of Schlegel's ideas is correct, Novalis must have gained an understanding of what was first "dunkel" to him before he could have finished hymn 5, and Kamla tries to trace the germination of Schlegel's ideas in Novalis' consequent letters.

For Kamla the question of date is closely related to the question of interpretation, he sees the cycle as a unified whole which shows the inner growth and development from "Sophie" (using this name to denote a complex of motives) to Christ and, eventually, God. The poem, then, would reflect Novalis' own development between 1797, when conjectured x was written, and 1799, when h was finished. The point of inception is the hoped-for reunion with the deceased betrothed, but in Novalis, and consequently in the hymns, this gives way to a general yearning for the infinite, there is a shift from the apotheosis of love to a hope for spiritual deliverance, from the erotical to the religious, from Sophie to Christ and God,—a shift foreshadowed, to be sure, in the diary of 1797 when Novalis wrote: "Christus und Sophie." Already Ritter had pointed out that the end of the first hymn in the manuscript version (h) speaks of night primarily in terms of "Liebesvereinigung":

Wir sinken auf der Nacht Altar  
Aufs weiche Lager —  
Die Hülle fällt  
Und angezündet von dem warmen Druck  
Entgluht des süssen Opfers  
Reine Glut.

It is only in the revision of this passage (A) and in the later hymns that night becomes the symbol of death and the metaphysical world. This shift, then, both explains the genesis of the hymns and at the same time constitutes the unifying theme of the hymns.

Within a much larger framework Maurice Besset comes to a somewhat related interpretation of the hymns. His topic is the place of Novalis within the tradition of European mysticism (more particularly his spiritual kinship to Jacob Boehme). His is a sound book, offering interpretations which, if not incontestable, illuminate the writings of Novalis.<sup>3</sup> A short, and necessarily summary, first section outlines the tradition of mysticism. Novalis represents a synthesis of the two main streams of mysticism, i. e. of pantheistic nature mysticism and of the mystical absorption in God. It is not new, but it is worth re-stating, that Novalis did not advocate a *contemptus mundi* but rather the acceptance of night, death, God, and the world of the spirit as something that can be recognized on this earth. In passing, Besset offers some valuable contributions to a study of the "Bildungs-idee" in Novalis, i. e. of

<sup>3</sup> By contrast we might mention so occult and esoteric an approach as that of Powell Spring, *Novalis, Pioneer of the Spirit*, Winter Park, Fla., The Orange Press, 1946

Novalis' very conscious effort at self-formation and self-discipline towards the *vita mystica*.

The inner history of Novalis' turn to mysticism, his calling or awakening to mysticism (l'appel), is the subject of Besset's second section. Novalis' diary of 1797, started two months after the death of Sophie, is regarded by Besset as the faithful record of this awakening. Against this it might be argued that the *divinatio*, the apotheosis, of Sophie must have previously been present in order that her death could become such an overwhelmingly strong spiritual experience. A third section of the book then deals with Novalis' inner preparation for his main poetic works (l'attente); Besset shows how, in his fragments, notes, and aphorisms (the bulk of which antedates the poetic works), Novalis poetizes and "mysticizes" thoughts that came to him from Fichte, Schelling, Hemsterhuis.

The last part of Besset's study is devoted to the poetic writings of Novalis (l'accomplissement). In *Die Christenheit oder Europa* Besset sees the theoretical exposition and definition of a new church, a third realm, a new poetico-religio-mystical world wherein are united the finite and the infinite, the real world and the metaphysical world, or—to quote from the song of Astralis at the beginning of the second part of *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*—the present and the future, reality and dream, life and death. Of this world the *Hymnen* are the immediate mystical vision, whereas *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* describes the stations on the way to this new world. If *Die Christenheit* is the theology of the new religion, *Ofterdingen* is its quasi-biblical story, and the *Hymnen* are the direct visionary experience of it. As Ritter had already emphasized, the *Hymnen* are not the report or account of a vision but rather the vision itself. Such an interpretation would, of course, gain support if the third hymn could be dated close to the "Enthusiasmusmoment" recorded in the diary of May 13, 1797.

The present reviewer must confess that he is baffled by Dr. Bus' dissertation and is not quite sure whether he grasped the author's main points. But Dr. Bus makes one observation that is relevant to the preceding discussion, namely that the rhythmic swing between antithetic moods and emotions in *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* is but a musical rhythm that is resolved in harmony and concord ("Ein-klang"); thus we may perhaps say that it is yet another expression of Novalis' anticipation of a new world of harmony, love, and sympathy; it is, so to speak, the rhythm of his own personality. The somewhat puzzling "Mythus der Musik" is perhaps explained by the following definition: ". . . mit Musik [ist] nicht das uberlaute Klingen Tiecks gemeint . . . , sondern vielmehr jener fast lautlose, mythisch erscheinende Gesang der inneren Natur" (p. 40). In a first section, Dr. Bus discusses Novalis' ideas, thoughts, visions ("Gehalt"), in the second part form, style, composition ("Gestalt") in the terms of music so defined.

A review of these three latest monographs does not exactly present a full "Forschungsbericht," but at least it clearly shows the international character of the present interest in Novalis<sup>4</sup>

LUDWIG W. KAHN

*College of the City of New York*

*Primitivism and Related Ideas in Sturm und Drang Literature.*

By EDITH AMELIE RUNGE (Hesperia, Studies in Germanic Philology, Nr. 21). Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1946. Pp. xii + 305. \$3.50.

Die vorliegende Arbeit gehört zu einer Reihe dankenswerter Untersuchungen, die im Anschluss an den Primitivismus-Begriff Lovejoy's versuchen, den kulturkritischen Stromungen fruherer Jahrhunderte nachzugehen. Wir sind im Angesicht jungster Geschichte ja wesentlich hellhoriger geworden für die ersten Anzeichen, in denen sich der Zweifel der europäischen Menschheit an Sinn und Wert ihrer eigenen Entwicklung ausgedrückt hat. Korff hat in seiner tiefdringenden Durchleuchtung der Goethezeit Rousseau als den ersten konsequenten Verneiner der modernen Entwicklung gesehen und die Aufeinanderfolge der drei grossen Wunschbilder dargestellt, welche die an sich irre werdende Kultur des späten 18. Jahrhunderts vor sich aufrichtete. Natur, Griechentum und Mittelalter.

Dieses Unbehagen, mit dem sich der zivilisierte Mensch von seiner eigenen Zivilisation abwendet, nennt Lovejoy Primitivismus. Nicht mehr imstande oder willens, sich in den komplizierten Verhältnissen einer allzu differenziert und unübersichtlich werdenden Kultur zurechtzufinden, ertraumt und erstrebt der Mensch einfachere und einheitlichere Zustände, die er nicht selten in frühere, bessere Zeiten zurückverlegt und als ideales Mass benützt, an dem die Gegenwart gemessen und verworfen wird. Das Gegenbild gegen die eigene Zeit, das der revoltierende Sturm und Drang aufstellte, hiess bekanntlich "Natur." Leider steht eine eingehende Geschichte dieses vieldeutigen Begriffes noch immer aus, für das klassische Altertum allein haben Boas und Lovejoy nicht weniger als sechsundsechzig verschiedene Bedeutungen zusammengestellt. Mit Notwendigkeit steht der Naturbegriff auch im Mittelpunkt

<sup>4</sup> As further proof of this international interest we should at least mention Novalis, *Petits Ecrits* (Kleine Schriften), traduit et présenté par Geneviève Bianquis; Paris, Aubier, 1947. Mme Bianquis' scholarly introduction to this bilingual edition offers valuable interpretations. Her earlier similar edition of the hymns was not available at the present writing.

Naturmensch entgegengestellt wird, im *Gotz von Berlichingen* namlich, wird doch die Vergeblichkeit und historische Ueberholtheit solcher Existenz tragisch unter Beweis gestellt.

Ohio State University

BERNHARD BLUME

---

*Die Wiederkunft des Dionysos; der naturmystische Irrationalismus in Deutschland* von J. H. W. ROSTEUSCHER (Bern: A. Francke A. G. Verlag, 1947). 266 pp.

The present volume investigates a certain trend in Western literature extending from the late eighteenth century to the present time—a trend which is peculiarly noticeable in German literature and is aptly designated in Nietzschean terminology as “Dionysian.” The existence of this trend is firmly demonstrated by the author, who, however, regards it from the grotesquely inadequate standpoint of the rationalistic Enlightenment. For his demonstration, albeit by the anthological method, the reader will be grateful; for a point of view which gravely treats some of the greatest works of German lyricism as products of mental aberration, there is no response possible except unrestrained hilarity.

The ancient error of identifying anti-rationalism with irrationalism is repeated in the first forty-seven pages of the book—as though no logical system other than that of the progressivistic post-Wolfians were at all possible. This “irrationalism” is then examined by the questionable psychiatrics of Muller-Eichbaum, and relations between it and the psychology of mobs are tenuously drawn by dint of quotations from Le Bon and Freud. A sketchy treatment of “Geistesgeschichtliche Hintergrunde des naturmystischen Irrationalismus” lays, as usual, a good deal of the blame on Rousseau, ignoring the whole bibliography on primitivism. Hamann and Herder receive scant mention, but Goethe is quoted freely and located among the “irrationalists” and “Naturmystiker.” (By the way, there is no such thing as “Naturmystik.” One might as well refer to “Allmystik.”) In view of the first chapter we are to conclude, presumably, that both Goethe and Sigmund Freud are alike in their need for a psychiatric consultation at Muller-Eichbaum’s clinic, along with Schopenhauer and Holderlin.

The second part of the work now deals with the “Jünger des Dionysos”: Holderlin, Novalis, Schopenhauer, Wagner, Bachofen, Nietzsche, Freud, Hauptmann, George, Rilke, Klages, and Thomas Mann. In this connection it is noteworthy that Nietzsche is examined according to his own conception of the “Dionysian,” and Freud, who serves as an authority in the first part, becomes the subject of investigation in the second. This is confusing, but the



confusion is twice confounded through the absence of any distinction between lyrical language and scientific language. Thus, the author finds it possible to examine a poem of Holderlin or Rilke and a treatise of Bachofen or Freud with exactly the same critical tools. Generations of critics and epistemologists seem to have lived in vain; Herder might just as well have never written his fundamental works on criticism, in which the distinction between "Poetische Sprache" and "Philosophische Sprache" was made clear enough even for such solid defenders of traditional logic as Friedrich Nicolai, Moses Mendelssohn, and the great Lessing.

The chapter on Schopenhauer stands out as an excellently written piece of work. The same can be said of the chapter on Freud. In both cases Rosteutscher's digests of an immense amount of seldom-read material can be used with great profit. The chapter on Klages is interesting, but too short to do justice to an important Dionysian of the twentieth century. The chapter on Rilke misses the point entirely, and that on Thomas Mann ignores the works for which Mann is famous and quotes merely from an obscure essay. One gathers that the author of *Die Wiederkunft des Dionysos* is at his best when he examines something to which rationalistic procedure is applicable, namely, to systematic philosophy, which is intended to be informative and not dynamic. Certainly, the possible literary relations—e. g. between Holderlin and Rilke, Holderlin and Nietzsche, Nietzsche and Rilke, Schopenhauer and Rilke, Nietzsche and Thomas Mann—are completely ignored, although there is a considerable bibliography on some of these points.

The book is clearly written, in pure style, marred only by repetitions of the phrase from Goethe's *Selige Sehnsucht*, "Stirb und werde!" This the author seems to consider specifically Dionysian, although many doubts as to its applicability at once arise. The simple fact is that the method used in this book is inadequate for the explanation or criticism of lyric poetry.

ROBERT T. CLARK, JR.

*The University of Texas*

---

*The Language of Tragedy.* By MOODY PRIOR. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1947. Pp. viii + 411. \$5.00.

This book exhibits in rare combination analytical power and imagination. Although cast in the pattern of historical survey, it is primarily a critical study of representative verse tragedies, English and American, from *Gorboduc* to the present. Animated by the hope that it may again some day be possible to write great tragedy in verse, Mr. Prior has set himself the task of establishing the relationship between the language of verse plays and the drama-

tic nature of the form. His central thesis is that in successful verse tragedy the poetry cannot be isolated. It is integrally related to the pattern of action and characterization which shapes the whole. "Artistic success in the use of verse in tragedy . . . is contingent on an essential formal relationship between a diction poetically conceived and ordered and the dramatic character of the work."

Mr. Prior is at his best in applying this principle to the Elizabethans. Here he establishes historical relationships and critical judgments with impressive originality. Analysis of the relationship between the verse of *Tamburlaine* and *The Spanish Tragedy* and the larger patterns of the two plays enables Mr. Prior to view afresh our somewhat jaded conception of their value as pioneering endeavors. With them "English tragedy had been clearly started in the direction of its artistic destiny—toward that final integration of proper means to proper ends without which no art can realize its possibilities." The betrayal by Beaumont and Fletcher of the more exacting elements in the Elizabethan tradition is clarified by his careful analysis of *The Maid's Tragedy*. "Poetry is here an adjunct of the brilliant moment." Mr. Prior's critical approach is somewhat akin to that of Caroline Spurgeon and G. Wilson Knight, but he is quite distinct from them in his insistence upon studying imagery as an integral part of the total dramatic effect. Thus he is enabled to view with original insight the two Shakespearean plays he analyzes, *Romeo and Juliet* and *King Lear*, and to celebrate them for achieving an "intimate relationship between the principal lines of development in the diction and imagery and the organizational scheme of the whole play." Post-Elizabethan plays he surveys in the same fashion but naturally with less admiration.

In view of the fact that Mr. Prior disclaims any attempt to answer all the questions his subject raises, it is perhaps captious to observe that his emphasis on one type of approach tends to minimize other aspects of the problem. Granting the validity and original force of his contention that the artistically successful play exhibits a style inseparable from its context of thought and action, the fact remains that this principle is only a partial criterion. In terms merely of the harmony of its constituent elements Galsworthy's *Silver Box*, for example, is at least as good a play as *Romeo and Juliet*. Any complete judgment demands that we ask further on what imaginative level this harmony is to be effected. And this is a problem to which Mr. Prior's approach provides no answer. Nor does his approach more than partially explain the inferiority of verse tragedy since the days of the Elizabethans. This decline would seem to be due to a variety of factors, chief among which is one that plainly disturbs Mr. Prior himself in his concluding pages: the tendency of prose with its more literal reading of life to take over the functions of poetry. Mr. Prior is obviously aware of these matters, but one mentions them here because his merely

incidental recognition of them creates the effect of a slightly blurred focus on the problem as a whole.

*The Language of Tragedy* is reasoned with an ingenuity and deftness that evoke admiration. Mr. Prior writes incisively. Of Browning's obscurity, for example, he observes, "Prospecting is worth the pains for gold and diamonds, but hardly for a common brick or two." Occasionally, however, the weight of his argument seduces him into an overweighted style. Now and then an excess of phrases like "manipulation of the linguistic environment" makes for somewhat heavy reading.

Mr. Prior concludes on a note of muted kope. Regarding recent writers of verse drama he says, "In their plays they have given some evidence that perhaps we have been overhasty in concluding that a poetic drama can never again make its appearance—in a form which we cannot foresee, but which will be suitable to its theatre and to its time." To the realization of that hope, his own book, so vigorously insistent on the integrity of the drama, makes a very substantial contribution.

FRED S. TUPPER

*The George Washington University*

*First Follow Nature: Primitivism in English Poetry, 1725-1750.*

By MARGARET M. FITZGERALD. New York: King's Crown Press, 1947. Pp. x + 270. \$3.50.

Miss Fitzgerald offers her study as one of the "special monographs on particular episodes' in the history of primitivistic ideas" for which Professors Boas and Lovejoy called in 1935. She intends to examine the "wider implications" of primitivism in terms of a great mass of poetry produced from 1725 to 1750 and to describe "the climate of opinion in which the poets great and small composed their verses." Her intentions are thus clearly and precisely defined. But the realization of them is disappointingly blurred and inadequate.

In the first part of her study Miss Fitzgerald breaks down her poems into their ideological components and arranges the bits of verse thus derived into primitivistic groups and sub-groups: Chronological Primitivism (Eden, the patriarchal age, the classical past, the English past, the present condemned in terms of a golden past); and Cultural Primitivism (the noble savage, tropical v. arctic simplicity, the pastoral life, etc.). Then she notes—but it would seem not carefully enough—Professor Lovejoy's statement that "the history of primitivism is in part a phase of a larger historic tendency . . . —the use of the term 'nature' to express the standard of human values, the identification of the good with that

which is 'natural' or 'according to nature,'” And she proceeds to the second part of her study, which she calls “Vivere Secundum Naturam,” in which she searches out poetic versions of the “natural” in philosophy, esthetics, and ethics. Here the focus of the study gets hazy. For we move, in effect, from the primitive to the natural when we know (*vide* Professor Lovejoy, above) that logically we should move in the other direction; the effect of Miss Fitzgerald’s exposition is to obscure the fact that the natural subsumes the primitive. At the end, the study is brought back into only partial focus with a hasty survey of primitivistic ideas in the poetry of Pope, Thomson, Gray, Young, Akenside, and the Wartons.

If the exposition of *First Follow Nature* tends to be thus imprecise, the meaning of the study tends to be more so both for the history of primitivism and, here more important, for the history of eighteenth-century literature. In the first place, the study becomes only by title and sub-title, not by content, a contribution to the history of primitivism. For the natural is not necessarily the primitive, is often necessarily the anti-primitive; “following nature” might well lead the Augustan from his primitive to his civilized self. Moreover, Miss Fitzgerald often does not clearly define such positive relationships between the natural and the primitive as her researches have made evident; so obvious a case as Pope’s “poor Indian” verses she treats under Cultural Primitivism and fails to mention in her discussion of Pope and “natural ethics.” This is to say in general that in the “Vivere Secundum Naturam” section Miss Fitzgerald takes us into areas for the study of which her initial concern with explicitly primitivistic ideas has not prepared us.

In the second place, Miss Fitzgerald’s practice of chopping up poems to make them yield their primitivistic content tends to make her book ineffective as literary history. We are seldom given a whole poem—or a whole context. Hence, since a poem has meaning in its milieu and is part of literary history as it is a whole poem, we learn little of primitivistic ideas as the poet “used” and so evaluated them, little of specifically literary developments. Further, one is surprised that Miss Fitzgerald neither mentions nor gives evidence of having made use of the work of several of her predecessors—Havens, Bissell, and Leshner, for example, she does not even make full use of the work of McKillop, which she does mention.

But most serious of all is Miss Fitzgerald’s failure to give us a sense of the cultural texture, of the complex reality, which makes for a climate of opinion. She has been little concerned with the vital problem of movement of ideas, even of literary ideas, in a given cultural situation. When occasionally she does sketch in a socio-economic background against which to set her documents, it is only to discover that poetic yearnings for a simpler life somehow

believe the conditions of actual lives actually lived from 1725 to 1750. The precise interaction between primitivistic yearnings and socio-economic actuality goes unexamined. Yet that is just what a description of a climate of opinion would seem to call for. Here, it is as though Miss Fitzgerald had simply told us that the climate of opinion was balmy and civilized, with a few shifting primitivistic breezes. And, as she herself says, we had already known this. We should like to know much more; Miss Fitzgerald promises much more.

Taken all in all, *First Follow Nature* may be valued mainly as preliminary notes towards a history of primitivistic ideas in Augustan Poetry.

ROY HARVEY PEARCE

*University of California*

*Mr. Review. Daniel Defoe as Author of "The Review."* By WILLIAM LYTTON PAYNE. New York: King's Crown Press, 1947. Pp. iv + 147. \$2.25.

With commendable enthusiasm Dr. William L. Payne has classified the "matter of the three million words" of Defoe's *Review* in an index listing 30,000 items. The need for an index was felt when the 1938 edition of the *Review* was being prepared. This one will be printed by the Columbia University Press, presumably in the format of the twenty two books of the 1938 text. A by-product of the index is the present volume, *Mr. Review*, a summary of what the *Review* says of its author. Much interesting information is presented under the five chapter headings: Self-Portrait, Author, Journalist, Economist, and Counsellor and Guide. In the last chapter, Dr. Payne, amplifying suggestions in my Introduction to the *Review*, points out anticipations of incidents and characters in Defoe's novels.

All this may be helpful to future students. And that is the justification for the book. Dr. Payne doubtless feels that the information he has on tap from the index should be published while it is fresh in his mind. He has thereby been saved the time necessary to a survey of previous Defoe scholarship and to research in the complicated problems presented below. The result is a study fuller than my Introduction but not so full as to thwart an adequate analysis.

Dr. Payne intends to lay the fear that there are in the *Review* "undiscovered nuggets of autobiography." He seems unaware, however, that the biographical information yet to be squeezed from the *Review* will come less from specific statements of Defoe about

himself than from the solution of numerous problems which Dr. Payne ignores.

Mr. T. F. M. Newton, Professor Sutherland, and I have discussed the implications of the issues of 28 April and 5 May, 1713, for Defoe's release from prison. Dr. Payne refers to Defoe's imprisonment, but the only passage he cites relating to it, that from the *Review* of 7 May, 1713, is to show Defoe's solicitude for his family. Farther down on the same page Dr. Payne might have found another problem which, I believe, Defoe biographers and bibliographers have not considered. Defoe there denies a malicious report in the press that the trouble "I have been lately in" was for writing an insolent libel called *The Ambassadors Speech*. What lies back of that remark? Similar problems which the *Review* may help solve are Defoe's relations with Mrs. Anderson, his Edinburgh agent and printer, with John Matthews, John Baker, John Morphew, and other London printers and booksellers, with fellow journalists, like Leslie, Tutchin, and Ridpath; and with the Sacheverell trial, the union of England and Scotland, and the treaty of Utrecht.

Dr. Payne analyzes the economic theories of the *Review* without reference to Professor J. R. Moore's book on the subject, and the impact of *A Tale of a Tub* upon Defoe without awareness of Professor John R. Ross's previous (though not overlapping) consideration of it in his *Swift and Defoe*. The titles of *A Tale of a Tub* (p. 5) and *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters* (pp. 10, 13) are given incorrectly. It is misleading to call Defoe the editor of *Mercator*, as Dr. Payne does (p. 72). And he has misread Defoe's discussion of bad husbands (p. 108, note 102), Roxana's first was not the extravagant husband but the fool.

ARTHUR W. SECORD

*University of Illinois*

---

*Smollett's Reputation as a Novelist.* By FRED W. BOEGE. Princeton Princeton University Press, 1947. Pp. 175. \$3.00. (Princeton Studies in English, No. 274).

Mr. Boege's book traces the course of Smollett's reputation from the publication of *Roderick Random* to the year 1940. Published materials in great variety — magazines, diaries, letters, memoirs — have been ransacked to produce a survey full of illuminating facts. Being practically a cento of quotations, the book is hardly designed for consecutive reading, but it makes a useful contribution to the history of literary taste and sensibility. Mr. Boege finds that Smollett's reputation rose steadily in the last three decades of the eighteenth century, with the result that he seems to

have become a formidable rival of Fielding. Blanchard's assertion that Richardson was the more formidable rival of Fielding toward the end of the century is shown to be highly questionable. The climax of Smollett's prestige came in the first three decades of the nineteenth century, when he appears to have been greatly admired by all the chief Romantic writers, except Shelley.

But at the same time the germs of decay were there. The popularity of Scott, followed by the deluge of Dickens, overwhelmed the works of Smollett, despite the high praise these later writers gave the man who helped them learn their craft. Soon, Victorian sensibility put Smollett on "the highest shelf of the bookcase," beyond the reach of wives and offspring. "As a novelist," wrote one critic about the middle of the century, "Smollett's reputation, once very high, is growing less every year with the best portion of the reading world, and must continue to do so as a love of moral purity shall continue to increase." The twentieth century has revived the sinner to some extent, but, except for one brief and suspicious spurt in the notorious "twenties," this revival has been largely the work of academics. And even among these, according to Mr. Boege, "one finishes with the strong impression that this is not a respected or beloved author", there is no good biography, and no definitive edition of his works.

Yet Mr. Boege's conclusion seems unnecessarily bleak. Mr. Knapp has long been engaged in the preparation of a full, scholarly life of Smollett, which is now, I believe, in its final manuscript form. There seems to be a warm appreciation of Smollett on many college campuses, and the years since 1940 have seen a considerable output of books and articles dealing with many aspects of Smollett's life and works. One wonders why Mr. Boege stands on his line of 1940 and speculates on what "another decade" may produce.

A few omissions should be noted. In discussing the edition of Smollett's works with an Introduction by Henley (1899-1901), Mr. Boege neglects the fact that the last two volumes of this edition, the *Travels* and *Miscellanies*, were carefully edited, with important comments, by Thomas Seecombe—the first scholarly treatment of Smollett's works. One should also notice Seecombe's important essay on the *Travels* in the *Cornhill Magazine* (n. s. xi, 1901). But such omissions are inevitable in a work of this kind. One is grateful to Mr. Boege for giving us this succinct and informative compilation.

Yale University

LOUIS L. MARTZ

*Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and Its Influence on Morals and Happiness.* By WILLIAM GODWIN. Edited by F. E. L. PRIESTLEY. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1946. 3 Vols. lvi + 463, ix + 554, 346. \$12.50. (U. of Toronto, Dept. of English, Studies and Texts, No. 2 )

It is refreshing to read a work about Godwin in which he appears in his true light as an eclectic philosopher, not as a gifted and original intellectual freak. Commonly *Political Justice* is viewed as merely a plinth or fundamental block, upholding a delicate and incense-enveloped temple of Shelleyan ideas. Mr. Priestley corrects this fallacious view by revealing *Political Justice* as a finished structure in itself, a noble edifice solidly constructed out of nearly every building material found in eighteenth-century philosophy. He gives an account not only of the conceptual patterns which Godwin followed, but of others which he discarded as unfitted for his philosophical structure. The first two volumes of this handsome edition comprise the text in photographic facsimile, and the third volume contains a critical introduction, notes and variant readings. The commentary includes sections on metaphysics, and on moral, political, and economic thought. Throughout the entire commentary, Godwin is considered as primarily a moralist, and the specific section on ethical thought leaves the reader with the feeling that everything essential has been said. Other sections leave some questions unanswered, however, and more material on the background of the social contract theory and the relations of Godwin to Mandeville and Hume would be welcome.

A large number of those who do not view Godwin merely as a mentor of Shelley customarily regard him as an economist. For these persons, Priestley points out that Godwin's approach is not the economic one, but that of moral philosophy. In aim Godwin resembles modern socialists, but extremists of either right or left would get scant comfort from the peculiar quality of his socialism. Relying fully on the possibility of the moral reform of man's ignorance and selfishness, Godwin is opposed to reform by positive institution. Yet his prescriptions would hardly fit modern advocates of "free" or protected enterprise, for he is willing to remove laws and institutions which aggravate or perpetuate inequality. Godwin's ideal political state is anarchism, a condition of freedom from governmental institutions in which reason is law, the happy status of Swift's Houyhnhnms. Priestley sees contemporary significance in Godwin's antitotalitarianism, a view of society as a general association preserving to the full the rights of dissenting minorities.

The highly-publicized sections of Godwin's treatise, such as his appendix on cooperation and marriage, have in the past been so greatly overemphasized that his primary doctrine has been mis-



understood. Priestley points out that this appendix in particular is only an appendage of hints and conjectures and has no bearing on the soundness or unsoundness of his main arguments. The penetrating discussions of Godwin's revisions correct a similar false impression that the later editions were a toning down or adulterating of radical passages and that consequently the first edition has the purest text. Priestley shows that the third edition best represents the essential spirit of Godwinism, and it is this text which is reprinted. The variant readings of the first and second editions are given for comparison. The last section of the commentary is a study of the influence of *Political Justice*, unfortunately brief, but valuable in exposing such fallacies as ascribing to Godwin a strong influence on Wordsworth.

A reprint of *Political Justice* has long been needed. The present edition not only fully meets the need, but produces in addition a sound and perceptive commentary on Godwin's intellectual milieu.

A. O. ALDRIDGE

*University of Maryland*

---

*John Bull's Letter to Lord Byron.* Edited by ALAN LANG STROUT.

Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1947. Pp. xiii + 170. \$3.00.

Nearly a quarter of a century ago the present reviewer commended *A Letter to the Right. Hon. Lord Byron. By John Bull* (1821) as "by far the most interesting of all contemporary bits of Byroniana," and "the only one which, I believe, is worth reprinting." After summarizing the contents of this pamphlet I concluded with the remark that "John Bull," alone among the critics of Byron during the poet's life-time, seems to fulfil Oliver Elton's requirement of an "alert and mischievous sympathy, crossed with protest" which Byron's satires demand.<sup>1</sup> In a footnote I called attention to Ernest Hartley Coleridge's copy of the *Letter*, now in the British Museum, which has pasted in it a letter, with the signature clipped off, speculating upon the authorship. The arguments therein given—the knowledge of Edinburgh and of Scottish literature; the knowledge of German, and the good command of the classics—led to the suggestion that John Black, of the staff of *The Morning Chronicle*, may have been the author. I thought that Coleridge's correspondent may have been Richard Garnett, who had contributed a note on the *Letter* to *The Athenaeum* (1903, p. 304) arriving at the same conclusion from the same, and similar, evidence. I was not myself convinced and in my bibliography I en-

<sup>1</sup> S. C. Chew, *Byron in England* (London, Murray, 1924), pp. 39-41.

tered the item under Black's name with a question-mark. Professor Strout does not understand this footnote and seems to think that the arguments for Black's authorship were mine, whereas I was merely summarizing the contents of the letter addressed to E. H. Coleridge. The matter is of small importance but had best be cleared up for the sake of the record.

It is of small importance because Professor Strout has discovered evidence establishing beyond any doubt that the author of the pamphlet was John Gibson Lockhart. This is proved by seven letters which passed between Lockhart and John Wilson Croker (six in the W. L. Clements Library of the University of Michigan, one in the National Library of Scotland) with an additional confirmatory letter from Croker to John Murray (in the Clements Library). All this correspondence is now published for the first time.

Professor Strout reprints the "John Bull" *Letter* with great care and annotates it fully. He has, moreover, supplied an elaborate apparatus of introduction and appendices. Parts of the introduction go over well-trodden ground, as when he narrates the early history of the *Edinburgh*, the *Quarterly*, and *Blackwood's*. In a valuable appendix all the contemporary allusions to Byron in *Blackwood's* are gathered together and summarized. Another appendix discusses Byron's possible indebtedness to *Faust*, which "John Bull" hints at. A third appendix contains a letter from Southey to Hogg which has nothing to do with Byron, and a letter from Lockhart to William Maginn reproving him for planning to "run down" Byron and suggesting that an entire instalment of the "Noctes Ambrosianae" be devoted to the poet's memory. This letter is undated but belongs to the late spring or early summer of 1824. It is of some interest not only as a hitherto unprinted bit of Byromana but as showing how the authors of the "Noctes" were wont to consult together.

This volume, charming in format and typography and interestingly illustrated, is a credit to the University of Oklahoma Press.

SAMUEL C. CHEW

Bryn Mawr College

---

*The Nascent Mind of Shelley.* By A. M. D. HUGHES. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1947. Pp. vii + 272. \$5.00.

The author's purpose in *The Nascent Mind of Shelley* is "to demonstrate the high degree of continuity in Shelley's main ideas and the relevance to his poetry of their worth and weight." His method is to devote 182 pages to a narration of Shelley's life up to April 5, 1813, and 81 pages to an analysis of Shelley's thought. The biographical narrative does not pretend to completeness or to originality, claiming only a re-examination of the source materials and a

liberal use of more extensive biographical works by Ingpen, Peck, and Newman White, and a fuller emphasis upon the origin of Shelley's ideas and upon his compositions through *Queen Mab*, in which virtually all his early thoughts are garnered.

Mr. Hughes's performance is not strictly in accordance with his announced plan. Though he does give more space proportionally to Shelley's early writings than do most of the biographers, he is inevitably preoccupied mainly with biography instead of thought, and he is forced to attempt to establish some new or generally unaccepted biographical views, the most labored and unsatisfactory being his notion of the great importance of Shelley's love for Harriet Grove. His earnestness in this matter leads him to throw caution to the winds and to state positively (p. 62 n) that "Harriet Grove is clearly meant . . . in line 271 of *Epipsychidion*. 'And One was true—oh! why not true to me?'" Though many of his inferences and reconstructions are questionable, his narrative is on the whole fresh and stimulating, and not infrequently produces instantaneous assent. The place of Miss Hitchener in Shelley's life, and the gradual realization of Harriet Westbrook's deficiencies are expounded with admirable insight. The halfway stage is marked by this striking sentence (p. 145): "He was trying to run two loves at once, no mind in the one and no body in the other, and to fend from his consciousness the inference that if both were wanted neither would suffice." It should also be said that there is new information about Eton in Shelley's day and an excellent account of the various reports of Shelley's radical activities received by the government in 1812.

In the last six brief chapters Mr. Hughes attempts a résumé of Shelley's thought under the headings: "Minor Poems and *Queen Mab*," "Shelley and Godwin," "The Rights of Women and the Law of Marriage," "Shelley and the Age," "God and Nature and Man," "The Sequel." Here there is no effort to restrict the treatment to Shelley's "nascent mind"; the full range of his ideas from youth to death is attempted. Though the result is stimulating, it is often confusing, both because of the difficulty in understanding Mr. Hughes's explanations, and because the brief account of Shelley's opinions on some topics does not take into account either the inconsistencies in Shelley's philosophy or the changes he made in it from time to time. Mr. Hughes constantly warns us that these inconsistencies and changes exist; but these warnings are of little help in particular instances. The analyses of the influence of Godwin, Mary Wollstonecraft, and Lawrence's *The Empire of the Nairs* are especially good, but it is to be regretted that so little is made of Locke's theory of ideas, which Shelley never discarded but combined with Platonism, and of the powerful influence of Wordsworth in 1815-16.

A few trivial errors may be pointed out, without any intention of

indicating extensive incorrectness or carelessness. In note 2, p. 29, "Grove" is misprinted "Groves." In note 1, p. 111, "pp. 348, 349" should be "pp. 341-43." On p. 46 Mary Shelley's death should be given as 1851, not 1852. It is extremely doubtful that *Alastor* gives an account of the "first coming" of love to Shelley: "How its first coming and departing shone and loomed in his memory we know from *Alastor* . . ." (p. 61). In the following for "wrote" read "printed". "They spent a few days quietly [in Dublin], while Shelley wrote his *Address*" (p. 134). The text of *Queen Mab* does not justify the statement (p. 186) that "the spirit of Ianthe . . . is rapt from the body as it lies sleeping *in her lover's gaze* [italics mine]." The lover Henry saw Ianthe awake, but he was not necessarily present during the whole period of her slumber.

The frequent neglect of scholarly books, and especially articles, although a defect, is paradoxically one of the causes of the principal excellency of the book. The reader feels confident on every page that the author is not repeating what others have written, but that he has examined the subject afresh and is admitting only that which he thinks is or may well be true. The book neither exposes the "nascent" nor the mature mind of Shelley, but it does afford many brilliant flashes of light.

FREDERICK L. JONES

*University of Pennsylvania*

---

*Shelley and the Thought of His Time: A Study in the History of Ideas* By JOSEPH BARRELL. New Haven. Yale University Press, 1947. Pp. viii + 210. \$3.00. (Yale Studies in English, 106.)

Dr. Barrell has here studied Shelley's relation to two phases of thought in the early nineteenth century the French survival and the Greek revival. As far as the radical enthusiast Shelley was concerned, the first of these centered in the *Weltanschauung* of necessitarian materialists like Baron d'Holbach, whose *Système* influenced the thought of Godwin and had consequent repercussions in the writing and thinking of Godwin's youthful worshipper. *Queen Mab* shows clearly the powerful effect of "Godwinism" in Shelley's early thought, and the author analyses that odd gallimaufry-poem with particular attention to its ideological content. He then carefully relates Shelleyan "Platonism" to the general revival of interest in Hellenic matters, and brings his attention to focus in detailed considerations of the 1816 hymns, *Prometheus Unbound*, *Epipsychidion*, *Adonais*, and *Hellas*. Introductory material and concluding summary aside, the core of the book consists of

four chapters: the two analytical chapters on the poetry and two others which seek to present in a systematic fashion the eighteenth-century background so far as it bears on and helps to illuminate *Queen Mab*, and the Hellenic revivals of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment in their relations to that early nineteenth-century revival in which Shelley was a prominent participant.

Dr. Barrell's chief contribution to the understanding of Shelley is the chapter called "Shelley and the Thought of the Greeks." While the pages devoted to the history of ideas offer succinct reviews of intellectual tendencies in the Enlightenment, they are admittedly derivative. The consideration of *Queen Mab* and its ideological background adds little except historical perspective to what has long been known and often said of that poem—particularly since the author has not chosen to explore its native literary ancestry. Indeed, though his treatment of the history of ideas everywhere proves the keen intelligence, the breadth of philosophic information, and the expressive skill of the author, the reader is often troubled by the discursiveness and the polyhedral nature of the argument as laid down and resumed among the multiple subdivisions of the book. But Dr. Barrell's reading of *Prometheus Unbound*, *Epipsychidion*, *Adonais*, and *Hellas* as philosophic poems is in many ways the most careful and precise examination of Shelley's entry into and withdrawal from the Platonic world-view which has yet appeared. One therefore wishes that the author had chosen to expand this section of the book from within and to take much of the remaining material out of range. He might then have been able to demonstrate the internal logical progression which took place in Shelley's thought between 1813-1819, he could have taken into account Shelley's reading in Greek literature outside Plato; the pervasive Dantean influence in the poems of 1821-1822 could have been observed and recorded, so that the exclusively Platonic emphasis could have been corrected. This is the kind of approach to Shelley that the facts of his development warrant and invite. Dr. Barrell has taken a useful and careful step in the right direction.

CARLOS BAKER

*Princeton University*

*Mary Shelley's Journal.* Edited by FREDERICK L. JONES. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1947. Pp. xxi + 257. \$4.00

Shelley scholars have long wished that Mary Shelley's diary were more accessible. It could be found complete only in the twelve printed copies and the Library of Congress rotogravure of the privately issued *Shelley and Mary*. Now, with Professor Jones's edition of the journal, every Shelley student may have on his desk this important biographical document, with the added advantage of informative notes, useful appendices, and a full index.

The reader of Mary's journal must not expect too much. Most of its resources have already been tapped by biographers and critics. Mr. Jones has added a fact or two and made one or two corrections of previous statements—none, however, of great importance. There are no startling revelations. With few exceptions the entries are laconic and factual. Mary was not only a cautious but also a reserved diarist: almost never until after Shelley's death did she comment on—sometimes she did not even record—the events which most moved her. But if the journal offers nothing sensational and little that is new, an edition of it is welcome not only to scholars but also to anyone interested in discovering at first hand what the Shelleys did from day to day, whom they met, what they read.

Mr. Jones was probably wise not to delay publication until the present owner of the manuscript journal was willing to release it for his use. Yet he must surely regret that he did not have the satisfaction of going to the source. It may well be true that the *Shelley and Mary* text is virtually complete and that omissions are unimportant. Whether it is also accurate enough to satisfy us all is another question. Dowden and Miss Grylls, whose testimony Mr. Jones accepts for the reliability of the text since they had access to the Shelley manuscripts, have both perpetuated some of the mistaken *Shelley and Mary* readings in letters which can now be examined in the Bodleian Library.

Most of the obvious errors in the journal entries Mr. Jones has corrected.

It is surprising, therefore, that he has not changed the spelling of Trelawny's name or emended the obviously impossible Greek in an entry by Shelley (Jan. 29, 1815). His understanding of French should have shown him that Carnot's "Memorial" (Oct. 31, 1814) is not an error for Carnot's "Mémoire," but a translation.

The notes identify most of the books Shelley and Mary read and the persons Mary mentioned. An occasional tentative identification, like that of Novello (Sept. 3, 1824), seems questionable. Several quotations, one a fragment by Shelley, are unassigned. Some cryptic initials still tantalize the student. Mr. Jones does not explain "S. T. goes on ill" (Nov. 4, 1820). Is Mary not speaking of the misfortunes of *Swellfoot the Tyrant* in printed form? Is "C. A." (Dec. 3, 1821) an error, as Mr. Jones says, for C. W. (*Caleb Williams*) or for an abbreviation of *Castruccio*, the novel which Mary had just completed?

These failures to go far enough in emendation or identification, however, are minor flaws in an otherwise well edited, handsomely printed book, a good desk companion to the two volumes of Mary's letters previously edited by the same scholar.

ELIZABETH NITCHIE

Goucher College

*Wordsworthian Criticism, a Guide and Bibliography.* By JAMES VENABLE LOGAN. Columbus. The Ohio State University, 1947. Pp. xii + 304. (Graduate School Monographs, English series, 4.)

The second part of this useful volume consists of a bibliography of editions, biographies, and criticisms of Wordsworth through 1944—six hundred and sixty-one items with descriptions of each and, for “prominent or recent books,” a list of reviews. The hundred and fifty pages which precede the bibliography are devoted to an historical survey of these Wordsworthian studies, examining important works in detail and pointing out developments and general tendencies. It is to be hoped that someone will follow the path here marked out to show how the tastes, interests, and sense of values of successive periods are revealed in what each emphasized, ignored, and praised in the poetry of Wordsworth.

“The Appearance of Specialized Research” is dated from the founding of the Wordsworth Society in 1880, although no evidence of the Society’s influence is presented. The author is on firmer ground when he emphasizes the significance of Legouis’ *Jeunesse de W. W.* (1896), for it is the discovery of *The Prelude* and the resultant importance attached to its author’s thought that distinguishes twentieth-century Wordsworth studies. Mr. Logan is conservative and cautious: he seldom ventures an adverse comment or ignores a negligible book. He might well have devoted more space to Bradley and Garrod, less to Brooke and Beatty, although including Beatty’s curious selection, *Representative Poems* (1937). It would have been helpful if he had pointed out the different deficiencies of Grosart’s and Knight’s editions of the prose and had mentioned that all of the prefaces but one are printed with the important later additions and omissions in the second volume of De Selincourt’s edition of *The Poetical Works*. Although a recent bookseller’s catalogue lists three items that are not included: S. F. Gingerich’s *Wordsworth, a study in memory and mysticism* (1908), A. B. McMahan’s *With W. in England* (1907), and C. T. Winchester’s *W. W., how to know him* (1916); yet these titles, along with those of numerous articles, may well have been passed over intentionally. The most serious omission is probably of books, like D. G. James’ *Scepticism and Poetry* (1937), not specifically devoted to Wordsworth. It is here that we most need help, for such works are not listed under the poet’s name in most indexes, catalogues, or bibliographies. Yet Mr. Logan has given us a book which specialists as well as novices in the field will be glad to use and which his full indices have made doubly useful.

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

*Longfellow and Scandinavia. A Study of the Poet's Relationship with the Northern Languages and Literature.* By ANDREW HILEN. New Haven: Yale University Press, London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1947. Pp. viii, 193. Yale Studies in English, 107.

This study seems to clear up in a meritorious fashion the poet's relationship with the Scandinavian countries as well as with their languages and literatures.

After showing in an introductory chapter that Longfellow's interest in Scandinavia was first roused by Scott's works and then fanned into a flame by a Swedish poet whom Longfellow met in Italy, the author describes Longfellow's unhappy stay in Sweden and Denmark in the summer of 1835. This brief stay, in spite of its disillusionment for the seeker of Northern Romance, gave the professor and poet that reading knowledge of Swedish and Danish which was to suffice for the rest of his life.

In the third chapter the author discusses "the extent of Longfellow's concern for Swedish culture," finding it rather shallow and onesidedly turned towards the romantic aspects of it. The fourth chapter discusses Longfellow and Tegnér, whom Longfellow considered the only great Swedish poet. Longfellow introduced Tegnér to America in a notable review of *Frithjof's Saga* with specimens of the poetry which Tegnér considered the best translations in existence at that time.

In this review Longfellow "questioned the wisdom of composing the ballads in different metres" but Mr. Hilen points out that he followed the same plan in his *Saga of King Olaf*. Says Mr Hilen: "This tradition began in Scandinavian poetry with Oehlenschlaeger's *Helge*," but he does not mention that it was inspired by the Icelandic *rímur*, which for centuries had perpetuated the custom.

In two more chapters the author discusses Longfellow's relations with Danish and Icelandic literatures, noting that his knowledge of the Icelandic was slight, though he probably read *Ólafs saga Tryggvasonar* in the original before he wrote his ballads on the story.

After a brief conclusion, the author prints Longfellow's Swedish journal, pertinent letters, and a list of his Scandinavian library. The rest is a list of sources in MSS and print as well as an index.

STEFÁN EINARSSON



*Apologia pro Vita Sua*, *The Idea of a University*, and *A Grammar of Assent*, being the first three volumes of *The Works of John Henry Newman*. Edited by C. F. HARROLD. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1947.

Both the range of Newman's work, and its remarkable combination of historical and contemporary value, make an available edition, complete or substantially so, almost a necessity. It was therefore essential, when the unsold copies of *The Collected Works of Cardinal Newman* were destroyed in the London bombings of 1940-41, that a new edition should be undertaken at the earliest possible date. Messrs. Longmans, Green and Company are to be congratulated for their prompt and on the whole adequate fulfillment of this need. Starting with the three major volumes before us, they plan to issue three or four more each year, until a set of about twenty volumes is completed, which would include, I assume, a large part of the total work. They have used good print on good paper, and supplied each volume with a full index. More important, they have obtained the editorial services of perhaps the outstanding Newman scholar of our day, Professor C. F. Harrold. His brief introductions manage to isolate the essential character of each book, and to place it skilfully in relation to Newman's work as a whole. As he demonstrated in his fine study of 1945, *John Henry Newman—An Expository and Critical Study of His Mind, Thought and Art*, Professor Harrold has the rare ability to assimilate large masses of learning, sift out major from minor issues, balance conflicting arguments, and then set down the results with great lucidity of form and style.

With so much to be thankful for, it is natural, if ungenerous, to wish for more—that this were to be the definitive edition which scholars must someday have. But the volumes are without notes, which is a serious defect because modern readers have lost touch with many of the religious controversies and theological terms that Newman does not stop to explain. Furthermore, the edition is not only not going to be complete, but even the individual works are subject to curtailment. The two acknowledged principles of selection are, "Works which bid fair to stand the test of time," and those which, though primarily of historical interest, "must be read and consulted if the reader wishes to understand the many-faceted mind of the author." Of the volumes before us, the *Grammar of Assent* is complete; the *Apologia* prints the text of the second edition (1865), with appendices containing the significant portions of the first edition (Parts I and II) that were not reprinted. In *The Idea of a University*, however, one is dismayed and puzzled by the omission of Newman's essay on "University Preaching" (the other omission, "Elementary Studies, 1854-56," would not be questioned). The justification is "lack of relevancy for our time." But even granting

that to be true, which is debatable, there is no doubt that this essay is of real importance for understanding Newman's many-faceted mind, for one facet, and an important one, was the preacher, and in particular the preacher of university sermons. His work of this kind holds not only a high place in the whole literature of the pulpit, but was perhaps the medium of his greatest influence upon Victorian life and thought. Indeed, Newman said himself that "it was at Oxford, and by my Parochial Sermons, that I had influence." Of these sermons his essay on "University Preaching" is a critical commentary of great value. Since Professor Harrold is well aware of this, one can only suspect that a third and unacknowledged principle of selection, in this case exclusion, has been adopted—namely, the arbitrary limitation, fixed by the publishers, of each volume to about 400 pages. Because *The Idea of a University* had already reached 413 pages, an essay even of demonstrable significance had to be omitted. Is the same thing to occur again, and perhaps again, in the coming volumes? The present damage, at any rate, could be rectified by printing "University Preaching" as an appendix to the volume or volumes that will contain the university sermons.

WALTER E. HOUGHTON

Wellesley College

---

*The Epigram in the English Renaissance.* By HOYT HOPEWELL HUDSON. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947. Pp. x + 178. \$2.50.

This book is a mine of information for students of the more obscure poets of the sixteenth century. In it they may trace the English translations of More's Latin epigrams, William Lily's literary quarrels, the metaphysical ingenuities of Richard Willes, a manuscript of poems by the diplomat Daniel Rogers, and ten pages on a long forgotten poet named John Parkhurst. Other writers included are John Leland, Walter Haddon, Thomas Chaloner, George Buchanan, Thomas Newton, and two French epigrammatists—Nicholas Bourbon and Théodore de Bèze. The footnotes are full of useful references, all to studies published before 1932. The editors inform us that the four chapters of this book were part of the doctoral dissertation which the late Hoyt Hudson submitted in 1923 and considerably revised in 1934-1935. Unfortunately much valuable work on his subject has appeared in the intervening twelve years, and the usefulness of the present volume is necessarily limited by this fact.

From the critical point of view the treatment of More and Buchanan, the two major authors involved, is disappointing. The method is rambling and episodic, with the result that no clear picture of the peculiar genius of each man is brought out. One

wonders whether Hudson, who was a man of excellent judgment, had not become aware of this weakness and therefore withheld his work pending further reworking. The editors, nevertheless, were right in deciding to publish this fragment. It contains a wealth of detailed research which will be welcomed by all workers in the English Renaissance.

LEICESTER BRADNER

Brown University

*The Satire of Jonathan Swift.* By HERBERT DAVIS. New York. The Macmillan Co., 1947. Pp. 109. \$2.00.

Originally delivered as lectures at Smith College, the essays which are brought together here are devoted to the three major phases of Swift's satiric art. The first essay—"Literary Satire"—is a discussion of *A Tale of a Tub* and the attitude of its youthful author. The second is concerned with the political satirist of *The Examiner* and the *Drapier's Letters*. The third and concluding essay is on *Gulliver's Travels*. Mr. Davis's tone and approach are throughout that of the lecturer who knows his business—and the limitations imposed by a general audience. It is only in matters of emphasis, shading, and the thrust of critical statement that one is occasionally prompted to take mild issue. Thus, the common-sense view, which assumes that the career, the personality, and the achievement of a great writer are more or less of a unity—a view which in the end may very well be the soundest one—does nevertheless sometimes prevent us from achieving direct insight into his art as a distinctive thing, as a mode whereby his imaginative apprehension comes to be concentrated and formed in dramatic terms. Mr. Davis's treatment of *A Tale of a Tub* is a case in point, for though he is clearly aware of the peculiarly Swiftian qualities of this great satire, he is committed to a manner of approach which makes it difficult to get to the heart of the matter. Nevertheless, the best thing about these essays—aside from the skillful marshaling of material, the critical acumen, and the pleasing style—is their insistence upon Swift as a writer. The chapter on *Gulliver's Travels*—"the final and completest satire on human life of this Christian moralist"—is a splendid recapitulation. Though there may be more in the *Travels* in the way of unifying design than Mr. Davis is ready to acknowledge, he does well to emphasize it as a parody of eighteenth-century Utopias, thus reducing to a subordinate rôle the element of political allegory, which has recently and I think erroneously been singled out as the dominant and controlling theme.

RICARDO QUINTANA

University of Wisconsin

## BRIEF MENTION

*Karl Lachmann als Germanist*, von H. SPARNAAY. Bern: A. Francke AG Verlag, 1948. Pp. 142. S Fr 11.50. Ein willkommenes Buch aus dem Heroenzeitalter der Germanistik. In der Gestalt Lachmanns ist der Augenblick erfasst, da aus einem schongeistigen Getandel mit den Köstlichkeiten des deutschen Mittelalters ein saurer Beruf wurde mit Systematik, Statistik und philologischer Akribie. In und durch Lachmann geschieht der Übertritt der deutschen Altertumskunde aus Raunen, Schwärmen, Pfscherei zu einer strikten Wissenschaft. Das Publikum freilich hat dabei kaum gewonnen, fühlt sich aus dem Tempel gejagt, so dass seit Lachmann die Zahl der Kenner mittelhochdeutscher Dichter geringer ist als die ihrer Werke. Kein Zweifel, dass mit Lachmann eine gewisse Verpreussung eingesetzt hat in einem Feld, das davon besonders viel zu verlieren hatte, andererseits war aus dem vagen Orakeln der Gorres, Tieck, v. d. Hagen weder für Textkritik noch für Textverständnis etwas zu gewinnen. — Bleibt in jedem Falle die verehrungswürdige Grosse eines Mannes, dem es nicht gegeben war, zugleich noch glücklich zu sein. Wenn er bei einem Kollegen aus einem Fehler, den dieser macht, auf einen, den er hat, schliesst, eine Lucke im Wissen als 'unsittlich' bezeichnet, ein Versehen also einem Verbrechen gleichsetzt, so weist diese Verwechslung des Intellektuellen mit dem Moralischen auf ein gestörtes Gleichgewicht des Charakters: Pfarr- und Kadettenhaus sind hier keine glückliche Verbindung eingegangen. Schlimmer als Lachmanns oft brutale Schroffheit, hochnasige Eigenwilligkeit, ja Eigenmachtigkeit (die er einem andern sicher nicht verziehen hatte), ist sein Banausentum, das sich z. B. im Urteil über den 'Tristan' ungeheuerlich verrät;<sup>1</sup> worauf dann auch mal wieder mit feinstem Ohr lyrisch-musikalische Details erfasst werden, die sich nur der höchsten Sensibilität im Ästhetischen erschliessen. Es ist ja nicht selten, dass der preussischen Gradheit in Sittlichen Zartheit im Musischen gesellt ist.

Das Buch Sparnaays spricht warm und verständnisvoll von seinem herben Helden, dokumentiert ausgiebig die Fakten und rafft dabei ein bedeutendes Material zusammen. Es wird immerwünschbarer, dass einmal Lachmanns hier und da verstreute Notizen und Anmerkungen gesammelt werden. Denn noch seinen Irrtümern liegen Ansichten zugrunde, die uns überall fördern können.

<sup>1</sup> "Anderes als Üppigkeit oder Gotteslasterung boten die Hauptteile seiner weichlichen unsittlichen Erzählung nicht dar." (Vorrede zur *Auswahl aus den Hochdeutschen Dichtern des 13. Jahrhunderts*. Königsberg, 1820).

An wirklichen Fehlern habe ich in Sparnaays schonem Buch nur einen gefunden, wo er den Titel 'Minnesangs Fruhling' Lachmann zuschreibt (S. 127); niemand, der Lachmann kennt, wird das glauben. Der Taufpate ist natuerlich Uhland.

A. S.

---

*Studies in the Literary Backgrounds of English Radicalism: With special reference to the French Revolution.* By M. Ray ADAMS. Lancaster, Pennsylvania. Franklin and Marshall College. 1947. Pp. vi + 330. This is a useful and readable book. With the aid of some manuscripts and of many books or pamphlets which are now inaccessible except by travel from one large library to another, Mr. Adams has collected the necessary materials for an account of eight writers who once played an important part in English radicalism during the period of the French Revolution. Though their names are familiar to students of literature and history, their writings and their personalities are little known and require the kind of interpretation which Mr. Adams has given. Most of them were figures of some public importance, and are now worth knowing because of their personal relationships with the earlier group of romantic poets and because of their intrinsic value as courageous representatives of a cause which seemed lost during the period of reaction. Mr. Adams is sympathetic towards the subjects of his biography, and the reader soon learns that these writers have been undervalued because of the successful partisan criticism of their contemporary opponents.

The group of political romanticists or enthusiasts is represented by Mary Hays, the disciple of Godwin; Mrs. Mary Robinson, "the exquisite Perdita," actress, mistress of the Prince of Wales, and ultimately poet and humanitarian novelist; Lovell and Burdett, minor disciples of Pantisocracy; and Joel Barlow, American pamphleteer and poet. The major controversialists are represented by James Mackintosh, who wrote one of the chief answers to Burke, but afterwards modified his radical sympathies. The Dissenters with republican ideas are represented by Joseph Fawcett, whom Wordsworth treated unfairly by using him as a model for the figure of the Solitary in *The Excursion*. The Whig liberals are represented by the kindly George Dyer, the friend of Lamb, and by the learned Dr. Samuel Parr, "the Whig Johnson." These are all figures whose minds were worth knowing, and the student of the period can learn to know them through Mr. Adams' book.

University of Nebraska

THOMAS M. RAYSOR

---

# INDEX

## SUBJECTS

- Aldington's, Richard, Proposed**  
 "Source" for *La Princesse de Clèves* 164.
- Alphabet**  
 Uguccione on the Name of Y 50
- American Literature**  
 Four Great American Novels 143,  
 The Literary Hero in a Sentimental Age an Unlisted Reference to Milton 259; Minor Knickerbockers Representative Selections 214, Southern Prose Writers 286.
- American Thought**  
 Making the American Mind Social and Moral Ideas in the McGuffey Readers 362.
- Aristotle**  
 The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1555 209
- Ashley, Robert, Of Honour** 435.  
*at erst* 365.
- Auden**  
 "Doom is Dark and Deeper Than Any Sea-Dingle" 548.
- Bacon, Francis**  
 Young —'s Tutor 483
- basket** 58
- Beaumont and Fletcher**  
 "Twenty Good-Nights." *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* and Middleton's *Family of Love* 233
- Beccue**  
 The 'Courtisane' in the French Theatre from Hugo to — (1831-1885) 204
- Beer-Hofmann, Richard, Werk und Weltbild des Dichters** 359
- Benda, Julien, and Hugues Rebell** 174
- Beowulf**  
 — in the Eighteenth Century 60;  
 Note on a — Passage 118
- Bertrandi, Cardinal Petrus**  
 —, Zanobi da Strada, and Petrarch 335.
- Blackwell's [Medieval] German Texts** 529.
- Boccalini in Spain** 503.
- Boethius**  
 A Boethian Parallel to *F. Q.* I, ii, 1, 2-4 543.
- Boursault**  
 Footnote on Calderón, Ravenscroft, and — 217, 219.
- Boyer, Claude, The Works of** 202.
- Brownell, William Crary, Literary Adviser** 290
- Browning, Robert, and A Blot in the 'Scutcheon'** 237
- Bulwer's Paul Clifford, Who Suggested the Plan for?** 489.
- Burns and Peggy Chalmers** 487.
- Byron, Lord, John Bull's Letter to** 568.
- Caesar**  
 —'s Sword 403, Julius — and the Tower of London 228.
- Calderón**  
 Footnote on —, Ravenscroft, and Boursault 217, 219.
- Campbell, Thomas**  
 Who Suggested the Plan for Bulwer's *Paul Clifford*? 489
- Cath Marge Rátha, On the Dating of the** 122
- cha[1]ele[s]** 240.
- Chalmers, Burns and Peggy** 487.
- Chamisso**  
 Adelbert von —'s "Peter Schlemihl" 272
- Chateaubriand, An Unsigned Article by** 472
- Chaucer**  
 Alceste and Joan of Kent 474;  
 —'s *Rosemounde* 310, The Diet of —'s Franklin 318, The Feigned Illness in —'s *Troilus and Criseyde* 372, Four Unpublished — Manuscripts 457, Geoffrey —, *Contes de Cantorbéry*, *Contes choisis* 140; The Meaning of "at erst": Prologue to "Sir Thopas," B<sup>2</sup>, 1884 365; A Note on —'s Tale of Melibee 53; On the Significance of Hengwrt's Change of Ink in the *Merchant's Tale* 325; Rape and

- Woman's Sovereignty in the *Wife of Bath's Tale* 378, Two — Allusions 1819 and 1899 55, Two Notes on the Chess Terms in *The Book of the Duchess* 30, "Vengeance and Pleyn Correccioun," *Knt* 2461 331; The Wife of Bath's Hat 381
- cheles* 240
- cheles* 240
- Churchill, Charles, and 'Statura' 114
- Clairaut, Alexis Claude  
A Letter from Samuel Richardson to — 109
- Clément, Nicolas  
The Alleged First Foreign Estimate of Shakespeare 509
- Coleridge  
—'s "Metrical Experiments" 491;  
A Note on —'s "Gutch commonplace Book" 130
- Cornwallis, Sir William  
*Essays* by —, the Younger 206
- Courtly Love, The Heresy of 363
- Cowley  
— and Evelyn's *Kalendarium Hortense* 398; —'s Pindar 184
- Criticism  
The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary — 209; see English —.
- Dante  
*La Porta del piacere (Paradiso XI, 60)* 339.
- Davenant, Milton's Aid to 538.
- Defoe  
Mr Review Daniel — as Author of "The Review" 564
- Desjardins, Mlle de, see Villedieu
- Dicts and Sayings of the Philosophers, The*, New Manuscripts of 26.
- Donne  
The Date of —'s "The Annunciation and Passion" 258; Sir Henry Goodere and —'s Letters 38; Two Cruxes in the Poetry of — 477.
- Droste-Hulshoff  
Der Tod als ewiger Augenblick 520.
- Dryden  
On the Persons in —'s *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* 88.
- Dumas, A., fils  
A Source for *Roderick Hudson* 303
- Dutch, Early, Librettos and Plays with Music in the British Museum 364.
- ealle prage* 127
- Eichendorff's Erlebnis und Gestaltung der Sinnewelt 272
- Eliezer, Rabbi, Milton and 262
- Eliot, T S, Mary Queen of Scots, and Guillaume de Machaut 187
- Emerson's "Days" and Edward Young 269
- English  
*Basket* 58, "Nether" and "Neither" in the Seventeenth Century 333, "Sooth" 436
- English Criticism  
English Literary Criticism The Renaissance 508, Homer in — The Historical Approach in the Eighteenth Century 142
- English Drama  
"The Language of Tragedy" 560
- English History  
Julius Caesar and the Tower of London 228
- English Literature  
A Bibliography of the Theophrastian Character in English 211, — in the Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660 190, Forces in Modern British Literature, 1885-1946 285; The *Palmerin* Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction 504, Studies in the Literary Backgrounds of English Radicalism With special reference to the French Revolution 580, The Theophrastian Character in England in 1642 211.
- English Poetry  
Elizabethan Poetry in the Eighteenth Century 496; The English Verses in the Huloet-Higgins *Dictionary* of 1572 251; The Epigram in the English Renaissance 577; First Follow Nature Primitivism in —, 1725-1750 562; A Fragment of Jacobean Song in Thoreau's *Walden* 271, Les Poètes anglais du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle 496.
- English Thought  
The Concept of Ingratitude in Renaissance English Moral Philosophy 427; The Metaphysical Society Victorian Minds in Crisis, 1869-1880 361.
- Evelyn's *Kalendarium Hortense*, Cowley and 398.
- Farmer, Richard, see Percy.
- Feminine Charms, An Ordnance-Map of 61.

- Fielding's *Amelia*, The Verge of the Court and Arrest for Debt in 104
- FitzGerald, Edward, Translator of the *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyám*, The Life of 432
- Fletcher, John, see Beaumont and Fletcher
- Folk-Tale
- Das europäische Volksmärchen Form und Wesen 422
- Folkvur* 128.
- Fontane and the German Revolution of 1848 450
- French Drama
- A Bibliographical List of Plays in the French Language 1700-1789 358, The 'Courtisane' in the French Theatre from Hugo to Becque (1831-1885) 204, Garrick at the Comédie Française 265; *La Vie théâtrale à Paris de 1612 à 1614* 10
- French Literature
- The Greek Anthology in France 352; "Monologue intérieur" in 1845 409, *L'Orient romanesque en France 1704-1789* T II 216
- French Poetry
- Literary Origins of Suricalism A New Mysticism in — 63; "La Wallonie," 1886-1892 The Symbolist Movement in Belgium 63
- French Press
- Victor Hugo's Acted Dramas and the Contemporary Press 204.
- Garrick at the Comédie Française, June 9, 1751 205
- Gavain, Sir, and the Green Knight* Tricus to Tuskan, —, Line 11 59
- German Drama
- Die romantische Komödie und das deutsche Lustspiel 413
- German Language, Joachim Meier's Contribution to the 293.
- German Literature
- Das Bild der Schweiz in der deutschen Romantik 416; Blackwell's [Medieval] German Texts 529, Deutsche Literaturgeschichte in Grundzügen 348; Deutsches Literatur-Lexikon. Biographisches und bibliographisches Handbuch 419, Der moderne deutsche Bildungsroman 417; Primitivism and Related Ideas in *Sturm und Drang* Literature 557; Quest for Mysteries. The Masonic Background for Literature in Eighteenth-Century Germany 500, Der Traum in der Dichtung der deutschen Romantik 416, Die Wiederkunft des Dionysos, der naturmystische Irrationalismus in Deutschland 559
- Gil Vicente, A Judeo-Portuguese Passage in the *Farça de Inês Pereira* of 342
- Godwin, William, *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and its Influence on Morals and Happiness* 567.
- Goethe
- Papers Read before the Society in 1945 420
- Goodere, Sir Henry, and Donne's Letters 38
- Greek, The, Anthology in France and in the Latin Writers of the Netherlands to the Year 1800 352.
- Grimm's Alleged Authorship of Certain Articles on the Theater in Paris 248
- Griswold, Hawthorne and 132
- Guillaume de Machaut, T S Eliot, Mary Queen of Scots and 187
- Guillén, Jorge, *Cántico* 212.
- Habington's *Castana* and the Date of His Marriage 182.
- Handel, see Smollett
- Hardy, Alexandre
- Vie d'—, poète du roi Quarante-deux documents inédits 61.
- Harvey
- New Light on the Nashe— Quarrel 481.
- Hawthorne
- and Griswold 132; —'s Use of a Pattern from *The Rambler* 545, Nathaniel — and the Tradition of the Gothic Romance 288.
- Haydn, see Smollett.
- Hebbels dramatischer Stil 413.
- Hegelian, The, Idea in *Hermani* 171
- Herbert of Cheshbury, The Birth Date of Lord 144.
- Herder, Johann Gottfried, *Journal meiner Reise im Jahre 1769* 289.
- Hoffmann's *Der Kampf der Sanger*, A Source of 526
- Hofmannsthal, Hugo von
- Der Tod als ewiger Augenblick 520.
- Holberg, Four Plays by 70.
- Holkvur* 128.
- Homer in English Criticism 142.
- Hood, Thomas
- Lowell, — and the Pun 346.



- Horace**  
The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1555 209
- Housman, A. E., and the New Prefect of the Ambrosian** 189
- Hugo**  
The 'Courtisane' in the French Theatre from — to Becque (1831-1885) 204; The Hegelian Idea in *Hernani* 171; A — "Pastiche" 471; Victor —'s Acted Dramas and the Contemporary Press 204
- Huloet-Higgins Dictionary of 1572, The English Verses in the** 251
- Hume-Rousseau Quarrel, A Sidelight on the** 486
- Hutterischen Chronik**  
Das Klein-Geschichtsbuch der Hutterischen Bruder 434.
- International Who's Who, The** 291
- Irish Literature**  
On the Dating of the *Cath Mairge Rátha* 122.
- James, Henry**  
A Source for *Roderick Hudson* 303
- Joan of Kent, Alceste and** 474.
- Johnson**  
Dr. — in *Partibus Infidelium?* 516; Hawthorne's Use of a Pattern from *The Rambler* 545, —'s Shakespearean Labors in 1765 512; Sam —'s Word-Board 43
- Jonson, Ben**  
"The Triple Tun" Again 56.
- Joyce**  
Fabulous Voyager —'s *Ulysses* 72; A Note on — and Yeats 552.
- Judeo-Portuguese, A, Passage in the Farça de Inês Pereira of Gil Vicente** 342.
- Jusserand**  
The Alleged First Foreign Estimate of Shakespeare 509.
- Keats**  
—' Elysium of Poets 19; "Sooth" in Shakespeare, Milton, and — 436.
- Kleist, Heinrich von, als politischer Dichter** 410.
- Lachmann, Karl, als Germanist** 579
- La Cruz, Don Ramón de, A Source of** 244.
- La Fayette, Mme de**  
Richard Aldington's Proposed "Source" for *La Princesse de Clèves* 164
- La Grange, le Registre, 1659-1685** 356
- Latin Writers of the Netherlands**  
The Greek Anthology in France and in the — to the Year 1800 352
- Leconte de Lisle's Poems on the Barbarian Races** 425.
- Leigh, Richard (1675), Poems** 291.
- Leonard's W. E., Annotations in a Copy of Poems 1916-1917** 185.
- Leopold of Austria, La Compilacions de le science des estoilles** 197
- Le Poittevin, Louis, Guy de Maupassant and** 463.
- Lermontov**  
"The Two Brothers of — and Pechorin" 149
- Lockart, J. G.**  
John Bull's Letter to Lord Byron 568
- Lodge and a Lucan Passage from Mirandula** 254
- Longfellow and Scandinavia A Study of the Poet's Relationship with the Northern Languages and Literature** 575.
- Lowell**  
James Russell — 215; —, Hood and the Pun 346
- Lucan Passage from Mirandula, Lodge and a** 254.
- McGuffey, see American Thought**
- Malkyn, The Merit of** 52
- Mann's, Thomas, 'Doktor Faustus,' A Nietzsche Episode in** 387.
- Mark Twain**  
A Letter from — to Francis Henry Skrine in London 134, More about —'s War with English Critics of America 221, Twain as Forerunner of Tooth-and-Claw Criticism 49
- Marlowe, Whetstone and** 436.
- Mary Queen of Scots**  
T. S. Eliot, —, and Guillaume de Machaut 187
- Maupassant**  
A Chinese Source for — 405; First Publication of —'s *Papa de Simon* 469; Guy de — and Louis Le Poittevin 463.
- Maxwell's, John, Sum Reasownes and Proverbes** 534.
- Meier Helmbrecht, The Judge in the** 95.

Meier's, Joachim, Contribution to the German Language 293  
 Melville  
     Call Me Ishmael 141.  
 Middleton  
     "Twenty Good-Nights" *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* and —'s *Family of Love* 233  
 Mildmay, Sir Humphrey Royalist Gentleman 429  
 Milton  
     The Annotations in —'s Family Bible 539, The Baptism of —'s Daughter Mary 264, John —'s Complete Poetical Work 208, The Literary Hero in a Sentimental Age an Unlisted Reference to — 259, — and Rabbi Elezer 262, — and the Creation of Birds 263, —'s Aid to Davenant 538, —'s "Paradise Lost" A Commentary on the Argument 68, A Note on *Samson Agonistes* L1 90-94 537, Ovid's Mulberry in —'s *Pro Se Defensio* 190; Plato and — 280, "Sooth" in Shakespeare, —, and Keats 436.  
 Mirandula, Lodge and a Lucan Passage from 254.  
 Molière, see La Grange  
     "Monologue intérieur" in 1845 409  
 Montesquieu  
     *De l'Esprit des Loix*, Books xxvi-xxxi 167.  
 More  
     The Correspondence of Sir Thomas — 291; An English Source for One of —'s Latin Epigrams 542.  
 Music, Poetry Preserved in 73  
  
 Nashe-Harvey Quarrel, New Light on the 481.  
*neither* 333.  
*nether* 333  
 Newman  
     *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, *The Idea of a University*, and *A Grammar of Assent* 576  
 Nietzsche, A, Episode in Thomas Mann's 'Doktor Faustus' 387.  
 Novalis  
     Der Mythos der Musik in —' *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* 553; — et la pensée mystique 553; —' *Hymnen an die Nacht*, zur Deutung und Datierung 553.

Old English  
     "at eist" 365; — *ealle bræge* 127; The Merit of Malkyn 52.  
 Old French  
     Anc Fr. *cha[ɛ]ele[s]*, *cheles*, *cheles*, *qu[ɛ]eles* 's'il vous plaît' 240, *Li Compilacions de le science des estoilles* 197  
 Old Norse *Holkvör* and *Folkvör*, Poetic Designations for *horse*, The Derivations of 128  
 Omar Khayyám, *Rubáyát*, see FitzGerald.  
 Oswald, see Smollett  
 Overbury's *A Wife*, The "D T." Poems in 177  
 Ovid's Mulberry in Milton's *Pro Se Defensio* 190.  
  
*Palmerin* Romances, The, in Elizabethan Prose Fiction 504  
 Percy  
     The — Letters. The Correspondence of Thomas — & Richard Farmer 506.  
 Petrarch, Cardinal Petrus Bertrandi, Zanobi da Strada, and 335.  
 Pindar, Cowley's 184.  
 Pius XI  
     A E Housman and the New Prefect of the Ambrosian 189.  
 Plato and Milton 280  
 Poetry Preserved in Music 73  
 Purchas  
     A Pilgrimage to the Holy Land 57.  
  
*qu[ɛ]eles* 240  
  
 Ravenscroft  
     Footnote on Calderón, —, and Boursault 217, 219  
 Rebell, Hughes, Julien Benda and 174.  
*Reinicke Fuchs* von 1577, Ein unbekannter Hochdeutscher 528  
 Richardson, Samuel, to Alexis Claude Clairaut, A Letter from 109  
 Ricovrati, The, of Padua, French Women Members of 161  
 Ronsard  
     —, Poèmes 200; *Sonnets pour Hélène* 200.  
 Rousseau  
     Coquilles 408; J.-J. —. *Discours sur les Sciences et les Arts* 423, A Sidelight on the Hume—Quarrel 486

## Russian Literature

La Geste du Prince Igor' Epopée  
russe du douzième siècle 502.

*Sawles Warde* 548

Schlegel, Johann Adolf, An Unpub-  
lished Letter of 382

## Shakespeare

The Alleged First Foreign Esti-  
mate of — 509; As They Liked It,  
an Essay on — and Morality 277,  
Caesar's Sword' (*Love's Labour's  
Lost* v n. 615) 403, Daisies Pied  
and Icicles 35, Essay on — 435,  
*Hamlet* without Tears 194; A  
History of Hamlet Criticism 434,  
Johnson's — an Labors in 1765  
512; A New American — Allusion  
401, Prefaces to — 194, "—  
Pays Some Compliments" 540,  
—'s Five-Act Structure 494; —'s  
"Histories". Mirrors of Eliza-  
bethan Policy 275; —'s Imagina-  
tion. A Study of the Psychology  
of Association and Inspiration  
431; —'s Sonnet No. 8 541; —'s  
Sonnets Their Relation to His  
Life 213; "Sooth" in —, Milton,  
and Keats 436, The Suffocation  
of the Mother 390; "Thieves of  
the Day's Beauty" 256

## Shelley

The Nascent Mind of — 569, —  
and the Thought of His Time  
a Study in the History of Ideas  
571.

Shelley's, Mary, Journal 572.

Sidney and Cupid's Dart 258

Skrine, Francis Henry, A Letter  
from Mark Twain to 134.

## Smollett

Bibliographical Notes on — and  
Oswald, Handel and Haydn 73,  
—'s Reputation as a Novelist 565  
*sooth* 436.

## Spanish Literature

Boccalini in Spain A Study of  
His Influence on Prose Fiction of  
the Seventeenth Century 503.

## Spenser

A Boethian Parallel to *F. Q.* I, ii,  
1, 2-4 543; Caesar's Sword (*Faerie  
Queene* II. x 49) 403; The Em-  
blem for December in the *Shep-  
heardes Calender* 181, Merce non  
Mercede 435; Mother Hubbard's  
Ape 145

Swift, Jonathan, The Satire of 578.

## Switzerland

Das Bild der Schweiz in der deu-  
tschen Romantik 416

## Tasso

—'s Annotations to Trissino's  
Poetics 153, An Unpublished —  
Sonnet 158

Thackeray, William Makepiece, The  
Letters and Private Papers of 282.

Theophrastian Character, The  
A Bibliography of — in English  
211, — in England to 1642 211.

Thomson's, James, Sources, A Note  
on 46

Thoreau's *Walden*, A Fragment of  
Jacobean Song in 271

Trissino's Poetics, Tasso's Annota-  
tions to 153

Tuvill, Daniel

The "D T" Poems in Overbury's  
A Wife 177

Uguccione on the Name of Y 50

Vaughan's, Henry, Conversion a  
Recent View 394

Villedieu's, Mme de, *Nouvelles afri-  
quaines* 292

## Walsall, John

Young Francis Bacon's Tutor 483.

Whetstone and Marlowe 436

Whitman, Walt, Further Reminis-  
cences of 266.

## Wilkins, Vaughan

*Beowulf* in the Eighteenth Century  
60.

Wise, Thomas J, and the Wrenn  
*Catalogue* 135

## Wordsworth

Contemporary Defense of —'s  
"Pedlar" 543, A Note on —'s  
"The Solitary Reaper" 493, The  
Poetical Works of William —  
*Evening Voluntaries* . . . *Ode;  
Intimations of Immortality* 507;  
—ian and Other Studies 290;  
—ian Criticism, a Guide and  
Bibliography 574; — in Politics  
the Westmoreland Election of 1818  
437.

Wrenn, The, *Catalogue*, Thomas J.  
Wise and 135.

Wulfstan's Vocabulary, Anglian and Saxon Elements in 1.

Yeats, A Note on Joyce and — 552  
Young, Edward, Emerson's "Days" and 269

Zanobi da Strada

Cardinal Petrus Bertrandi, —, and Petrarach 335

Zola, Emile from Fact to Fiction 407

# AUTHORS OF ARTICLES AND OF BOOKS REVIEWED

Adams, M. R, Studies in the Literary Backgrounds of English Radicalism 580

Adkins, N. F., Emerson's "Days" and Edward Young 269

Alexander, H. (tr.), Four Plays by Holberg with an Intro. by O. J. Campbell 70

Allen, D. C., Cowley's Pindar 184; (ed.) *Essays* by Sir William Cornwallis, the Younger 206; Milton and Rabbi Eliezer 262; Milton and the Creation of Birds 263

Ames, A. C., Contemporary Defense of Wordsworth's "Pedlar" 543

Armstrong, E. A., Shakespeare's Imagination 431

Artinian, A., First Publication of Maupassant's *Papa de Simon* 469; Guy de Maupassant and Louis Le Poittevin 463

Artola, G. T. and W. A. Eichengreen, A Judeo-Portuguese Passage in the *Faça de Inês Pereira* of Gil Vicente 342

Atkins, J. W. H., English Literary Criticism The Renaissance 508.

Austin, H. D., Uguccione on the Name of Y 50.

Balakian, A., Literary Origins of Surrealism 63

Baldwin, T. W., Shakespeare's Five-Act Structure 494

Bandy, W. T., A Sidelight on the Hume-Rousseau Quarrel 486

Banks, T. H., Shakespeare's Sonnet No. 8 541

Barbier, A. (ed.), *Poèmes* Par Pierre de Ronsard 200.

Barrell, J., Shelley and the Thought of His Time 571.

Baumgartner, U., Adelbert vom Chamisso's "Peter Schlemihl" 272

Berger, B., Der moderne deutsche Bildungsroman 417.

Besset, M., Novalis et la pensée mystique 553.

Blankenagel, J. C., A Nietzsche Episode in Thomas Mann's 'Doktor Faustus' 387

Bloomfield, M. W., "Doom is Dark and Deeper Than Any Sea-Dingle" 548

Boege, F. W., Smollett's Reputation as a Novelist 565.

Boesch, B. (ed.), Deutsche Literaturgeschichte in Grundzügen 348.

Bond, W. H., Sidney and Cupid's Dart 258

Boyce, B., The Theophrastian Character in England in 1642 211

Braun, S. D., The 'Courtisane' in the French Theatre from Hugo to Becque (1831-1885) 204

Brenner, C. D., A Bibliographical List of Plays in the French Language 1700-1789 358

Brady, C. C., The Works of Claude Boyer 202

Brinson, B. H., Daisies Pied and Icicles 35

Brooke, T., Essays on Shakespeare 435.

Brooks, C. (ed.), The Percy Letters The Correspondence of Thomas Percy & Richard Farmer 506

Brown, A. W., The Metaphysical Society 361.

Bryant, J. A., Jr., The Diet of Chaucer's Franklin 318

Buhler, C. F., New Manuscripts of *The Dicts and Sayings of the Philosophers* 26

Buhrig, K., Hebbels dramatischer Stil 413

Bus, A. J. M., Der Mythos der Musik in Novalis' *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* 553

Bush, D., English Literature in the Seventeenth Century 1600-1660 190

Camden, C., The Suffocation of the Mother 390.

Campbell, L. B., Shakespeare's "Histories" 275.

- Campbell, O J., see Alexander, H
- Carmody, F J (ed.), Leopold of Austria, *La Compilacions de le science des estoilles* 197
- Casaldueiro, J, Jorge Guillén *Cántico* 212
- Cassidy, F. G., The Merit of Malkyn 52.
- Chapman, C O, Ticius to Tuskan, *GGK*, Line 11 59
- Clark, H H and N Foerster, James Russell Lowell 215
- Coe, C N, A Note on Wordsworth's "The Solitary Reaper" 493
- Coleman, R A, Further Reminiscences of Walt Whitman 266
- Combs, H C, Habington's *Castara* and the Date of His Marriage 182
- Condee, R W, Lodge and a Lucan Passage from *Mirandula* 254
- Conklin, P. S., A History of Hamlet Criticism 434
- Cooley, F. D., Two Notes on the Chess Terms in *The Book of the Duchess* 30.
- Darbishire, H, see Selincourt, E De
- Davidson, Frank, Hawthorne's Use of a Pattern from *The Rambler* 545.
- Davis, Herbert, The Satire of Jonathan Swift 578
- Deierkauf - Holsboer, S W, *Vie d'Alexandre Hardy* 61; *La Vie théâtrale à Paris de 1612 à 1614* 10.
- Delcourt, J. (ed.), Geoffrey Chaucer, *Contes de Cantorbéry*, Contes choisis 140
- Dempster, G., On the Significance of Hengwrt's Change of Ink in the *Merchant's Tale* 325
- Denny, M., The Literary Hero in a Sentimental Age: an Unlisted Reference to Milton 259
- Denomy, A J, The Heresy of Courtly Love 363
- Deutsch, O E, Poetry Preserved in Music 73
- Diekhoff, J. S., Milton's "Paradise Lost" 68.
- Douglas, W W., Wordsworth in Politics 437.
- Draper, J. W., Thomas J Wise and the Wrenn *Catalogue* 135.
- Duffy, C., W. E. Leonard's Annotations in a Copy of *Poems* 1916-1917 185.
- Dufrenoy, M-L, *L'Orient romanesque en France 1704-1789*. T. II. 216
- Dunbar, V, A Source for *Roderick Hudson* 303
- Dunlap, A R, A Pilgrimage to the Holy Land 57
- Dunlap, R, The Date of Donne's "The Annunciation and Passion" 258
- Dunn, E C, The Concept of Ingratitude in Renaissance English Moral Philosophy 427.
- Eastman, A. M., Johnson's Shakespearean Labors in 1765 512
- Eichengreen, W A, see Artola, G. T.
- Elton, W, "Sooth" in Shakespeare, Milton, and Keats 436
- Evans, D O, The Hegelian Idea in *Hernani* 171.
- Fairhe, A., Leconte de Lisle's Poems on the Barbarian Races 425.
- Feinstein, G. W., Twain as Fore-runner of Tooth-and-Claw Criticism 49
- Fitzgerald, M. M., First Follow Nature 562
- Fletcher, H F. (ed.), John Milton's Complete Poetical Works 208
- Foerster, D M., Homer in English Criticism 142
- Foerster, N, see Clark, H. H.
- Françon, M., Coquilles 408.
- French, J M., The Baptism of Milton's Daughter Mary 264, see Greenough, C N.
- Gilbert, A H, The Embleme for December in the *Shepherd's Calendar* 181, Ovid's Mulberry in Milton's *Pro Se Defensio* 190
- Gillies, A (ed.), J G Herder, *Journal meiner Reiser im Jahre* 1769 289.
- Giovannini, G., Keats' Elysium of Poets 19.
- Granville-Barker, H., Prefaces to Shakespeare 194
- Greenough, C N, A Bibliography of the Theophrastian Character in English (prepared for publication by J M. French) 211
- Grégoire, H., R. Jakobson, M. Szeftel, J A Joffe (eds.), *La Geste du Prince Igor* 502.
- Guttinger, F., Die romantische Komodie und das deutsche Lustspiel 413.

- Hamilton, H. E., A Note on James Thomson's Sources 46
- Harbage, A., As They Liked It, an Essay on Shakespeare and Morality 277.
- Harold, C. F. (ed.), J. H. Newman, *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, *The Idea of a University*, and *A Grammar of Assent* 576.
- Havens, G. R. (ed.), J.-J. Rousseau, *Discours sur les Sciences et les Arts* 423.
- Heltzel, V. B. (ed.), Robert Ashley, *Of Honour* 435, Young Francis Bacon's Tutor 483
- Herrick, M. T., The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1555 209.
- Hewett-Thayer, H. W., A Source of Hoffmann's *Der Kampf der Sanger* 526.
- Hilen, A., Longfellow and Scandinavia 575.
- Hinman, C., "Nether" and "Neither" in the Seventeenth Century 333
- Hollingsworth, K., Who Suggested the Plan for Bulwer's *Paul Clifford*? 489
- Holsboer, see Deierkauf-Holsboer
- Hudson, H. H., The Epigram in the English Renaissance 577
- Hughes, A. M. D., The Nascent Mind of Shelley 569
- Hughes, M. Y., A Boethian Parallel to *F. Q.*, I, II, 1, 2-4 543.
- Huntley, F. L., On the Persons in Dryden's *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* 88
- Huppé, B. F., Rape and Woman's Sovereignty in the *Wife of Bath's Tale* 378
- Hutton, J., The Greek Anthology in France 352.
- Jakobson, R., see Grégoire, H.
- Joffe, J. A., see Grégoire, H.
- Johnson, Stanley, Sir Henry Goodere and Donne's Letters 38
- Jones, F. L. (ed.), Mary Shelley's Journal 572
- Judson, A. C., Mother Hubbard's Ape 145.
- Kain, R. M., Fabulous Voyager: James Joyce's *Ulysses* 72.
- Kamla, H., Novalis' *Hymnen an die Nacht*, zur Deutung und Datierung 553.
- Kane, R. J., A. E. Housman and the New Prefect of the Ambrosian 189.
- Kelley, Maurice, The Annotations in Milton's Family Bible 540.
- Kirby, T. A., "The Triple Tun" Again 56.
- Kokeritz, H., Chaucer's *Rosemounde* 310.
- Kosch, W., Deutsches Literatur-Lexikon 419
- Kreuzer, J. R., A Note on Chaucer's *Tale of Melibee* 53.
- Kunelmeyer, W., Joachim Meier's Contribution to the German Language 293.
- Lancaster, H. C., The Alleged First Foreign Estimate of Shakespeare 509, The Birth Date of Lord Herbert of Cherbury 144; A Chinese Source for Maupassant 405, Garrick at the Comédie Française, June 9, 1751 265; Reply (to J. U. Rundle) 219
- Lavaud, J. (ed.), *Sonnets pour Hélène* Par Pierre de Ronsard 200.
- Le Comte, E. S., "Thieves of the Day's Beauty" 256.
- Lemonnier, L., Les Poètes anglais du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle 496
- Liebi, A., Das Bild der Schweiz in der deutschen Romantik 416.
- Lievsay, J. L., The "D. T." Poems in Overbury's *A Wife* 177.
- Linn, R., Fontane and the German Revolution of 1848 450.
- Loewenberg, A., Early Dutch Librettos 364
- Logan, J. V., Wordsworthian Criticism 574.
- Luthi, M., Das europäische Volksmarchen 422
- Lundblad, J., Nathaniel Hawthorne and the Tradition of the Gothic Romance 288.
- McCue, G. S., Sam. Johnson's Word-Hoard 43.
- Macdonald, H. (ed.), *Poems*, by Richard Leigh (1675) 291.
- McKeithan, D. M., A Letter from Mark Twain to Francis Henry Skrine in London 134; More about Mark Twain's War with English Critics of America 221.
- Mackenzie, B. A., Shakespeare's Sonnets: Their Relation to His Life 213.

- McKillop, A. D., A Letter from Samuel Richardson to Alexis Claude Clairaut 109
- Magoun, F. P., Jr., *OE ealle þræge* 127.
- Manning, C. A., *The Two Brothers* of Lermontov and Pechorin 149.
- Marilla, E. L., Henry Vaughan's Conversion 394.
- Marsh, Philip, Hawthorne and Griswold 132
- Mathews, A. J., "La Wallonie," 1886-1892 63
- Maxwell, B., "Twenty Good-Nights" *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* and Middleton's *Family of Love* 233.
- Mazwell, J. C., Whetstone and Marlowe 436
- Menner, R. J., Anghian and Saxon Elements in Wulfstan's Vocabulary 1.
- Me Tsung Kaung Tang, W. C. Brownell 290
- Miller, C. W., Cowley and Evelyn's *Kalendarium Hortense* 398
- Morrisette, B. A., Richard Aldington's Proposed "Source" for *La Princesse de Clèves* 164
- Mosier, R. D., Making the American Mind 362
- Mossner, E. C., Dr Johnson in *Partibus Infidelium* 516
- Muscatine, C., The Feigned Illness in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* 372.
- Nearing, H., Jr., Caesar's Sword 403; Julius Caesar and the Tower of London 228
- Niess, R. J., Emile Zola from Fact to Fiction 407; Julien Benda and Hughes Rebell 174.
- Nordmeyer, G., The Judge in the *Meier Helmbrecht* 95.
- Nozick, M., A Source of Don Ramón de la Cruz 244.
- Oake, R. B., *De l'Esprit des Lois*, Books xxvi-xxxii 167
- Oberholzer, O., Richard Beer-Hofmann 359
- Olson, C., Call Me Ishmael 141.
- Pace, G. B., Four Unpublished Chaucer Manuscripts 457.
- Paine, G., Southern Prose Writers 286.
- Patchell, M., *The Palmerin Romances* in Elizabethan Prose Fiction 504
- Payne, W. L., Mr Review 564
- Pendell, W. D., Victor Hugo's Acted Dramas and the Contemporary Press 204.
- Porter, K., Burns and Peggy Chalmers 487
- Pratt, R. A., Two Chaucer Allusions 1819 and 1899 55.
- Priestley, F. E. L. (ed.), W. Godwin, *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* 567.
- Prior, M., The Language of Tragedy 560.
- Ralph, P. L., Sir Humphrey Mildmay 429.
- Katchford, F., Comment on Wise and Wrenn 138
- Ray, G. N. (ed.), The Letters and Private Papers of William Makepiece Thackeray 282
- Reese, G., Robert Browning and *A Blot in the 'Scutcheon* 237
- Ritzler, P., Der Traum in der Dichtung der deutschen Romantik 416
- Rogers, E. F. (ed.), The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More 291.
- Roppolo, J. P., The Meaning of "at erst" 365.
- Rosteutscher, J. H. W., Die Wiederkunft des Dionysos 559
- Rundle, J. U., Footnote on Calderón, Ravenscroft, and Boursault 217
- Runge, E. A., Primitivism and Related Ideas in *Sturm und Drang* Literature 557.
- Ryland, H., An Unsigned Article by Chateaubriand 472.
- Sabol, A. J., An English Source for One of More's Epigrams 542.
- Samuel, I., Plato and Milton 280
- Schaffer, A., A Hugo "Pastiche" 471
- Schirokauer, A., Blackwell's [Medieval] German Texts 529, Ein unbekannter hochdeutscher *Reimnove* *Fuchs* von 1577 528
- Schneider, H., Quest for Mysteries 500.
- Schoeck, R. J., T. S. Eliot, Mary Queen of Scots, and Guillaume de Machaut 187
- Schultz, H., A Fragment of Jacobean Song in Thoreau's *Walden* 271
- Schwartz, W. L., "Monologue intérieur" in 1845 409.

- Selincourt, E. De, Wordsworthian and Other Studies 290
- Selincourt, E. De, and H. Darbishire (eds.), *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth* 507
- Semper, I. J., *Hamlet* without Tears 194
- Shanker, S., "Shakespeare Pays Some Compliments" 540
- Short, R. W. (ed.), *Four Great American Novels* 143
- Singleton, C. S., *La Porta del piacere* 339
- Sledd, J., The English Verses in the Hulot-Higgins *Dictionary* of 1572 251.
- Smiley, J. R., Grimm's Alleged Authorship of Certain Articles on the Theater in Paris 248
- Smith, D. N. (ed.), *The Percy Letters* 506.
- Smith, Roland M., On the Dating of the *Cath Maige Rátha* 122
- Sparnaay, H., Karl Lachmann als Germanist 579
- Spitzer, L., *Anc Fr cha[i]ele[s], chelcs, chueles, qu[i]eles 's'il vous plaît'* 240, *Basket* 58.
- Splitter, H. W., Note on a "Beowulf" Passage 118.
- Starr, H. W., *Beowulf* in the Eighteenth Century 60.
- Stephens, J. C., Jr., The Verge of the Court and Arrest for Debt in Fielding's *Amelia* 104
- Storer, M. E., French Women Members of the Ricovrati of Padua 161, Mme de Villegien's *Nouvelles africaines* 292
- Strout, A. L. (ed.) John Bull's Letter to Lord Byron 568
- Sturtevant, A. M., The Derivations of Old Norse *Hölkvur* and *Fölkvur* 128
- Syford, C. M., *Merce non Mercede* 435
- Szeftel, M., see Grégoire, H.
- Taft, K. B. (ed.), *Minor Knickerbockers* 214.
- Taylor, A., An Ordnance-Map of Feminine Charms 61.
- Terhune, A. McK., The Life of Edward Fitzgerald 432.
- Thomas, S., New Light on the Nashe-Harvey Quarrel 481.
- Thorpe, James, A Note on Coleridge's "Gutch Commonplace Book" 130.
- Tindall, W. Y., Forces in Modern British Literature, 1885-1946 285.
- Turner, W. A., Milton's Aid to Davenant 538
- Vordtriede, W., *Der Tod als ewiger Augenblick* 520.
- Voss, A., Lowell, Hood and the Pun 346.
- Waldhorn, A., Charles Churchill and 'Statira' 114.
- Wasserman, E. R., Coleridge's "Metrical Experiments" 491; Elizabethan Poetry in the Eighteenth Century 496
- Weese, W. E., Alceste and Joan of Kent 474, "Vengeance and Pleyne Correccioun" 331.
- Wehrli, R., Eichendorff's Erlebnis und Gestaltung der Sinnenwelt 272.
- Wendell, J. P., Two Cruxes in the Poetry of Donne 477.
- Westfall, A., A New American Shakespeare Allusion 401
- Whiting, B. J., John Maxwell's *Sum Reasounes and Proverbes* 534
- Wilkins, E. H., Cardinal Petrus Bertrand, Zanobi da Strada, and Petrarch 335
- Williams, Arnold, A Note on *Samson Agonistes* 537
- Williams, R. H., Boccacini in Spain 503
- Williamson, E., Tasso's Annotations to Trissino's Poetics 153; An Unpublished Tasso Sonnet 158.
- Willoughby, L. A. (ed.), Papers Read before the Society in 1945 420.
- Witt, M., A Note on Joyce and Yeats 552.
- Wolff, H. M., Heinrich von Kleist als politischer Dichter 410
- Wietling, D. E., The Wife of Bath's Hat 361.
- Young, B. E. et G. P. Young (eds.), *Le Registre de La Grange* 356.
- Young, G. P., see Young, B. E.
- Zeydel, E. H., An Unpublished Letter of Johann Adolf Schlegel 382.
- Zieglschmid, A. J. F., *Das Klein-Geschichtsbuch der Hutterischen Bruder* 434.



## REVIEWERS

- Aldridge, A. O.: F E L Priestley (ed.), W. Godwin, *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* 567
- Allen, D. C.: J. W. H. Atkins, English Literary Criticism The Renaissance 508; B. Boyce, The Theophrastian Character in England to 1642 211; T. Brooke, Essays on Shakespeare 435; P. S. Conklin, A History of Hamlet Criticism 434; C. N. Greenough, A Bibliography of the Theophrastian Character in English 211; V. B. Heltzel (ed.), Robert Ashley, *Of Honour* 435; H. Macdonald (ed.), *Poems*, by Richard Leigh (1675) 291, E. F. Rogers (ed.), The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More 291
- Baker, Carlos: J. Barrell, Shelley and the Thought of His Time 571
- Bang, C. K.: H. Alexander (tr.), Four Plays by Holberg 70.
- Beatty, R. C.: H. H. Clark and N. Foerster, James Russell Lowell 215
- Blankenagel, J. C.: H. M. Wolff, Heinrich von Kleist als politischer Dichter 410
- Blau, J. L.: R. D. Mosier, Making the American Mind 362
- Blume, B. E. A. Runge, Primitivism and Related Ideas in *Sturm und Drang* Literature 557
- Bradner, L.: H. H. Hudson, The Epigram in the English Renaissance 577.
- Bronson, B. H.: E. R. Wasserman, Elizabethan Poetry in the Eighteenth Century 496; L. Lemonnier, Les Poètes anglais du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle 496
- Buckley, J. H.: W. Y. Lindall, Forces in Modern British Literature, 1885-1946 285
- Chase, R.: R. M. Kain, Fabulous Voyager: James Joyce's *Ulysses* 72.
- Chew, S. C.: A. L. Strout, John Bull's Letter to Lord Byron 568.
- Clark, R. T., Jr.: J. H. W. Rosentscher, Die Wiederkunft des Dionysos 559.
- Clements, R. J.: J. Hutton, The Greek Anthology in France 352.
- Dawson, G. E.: P. L. Ralph, Sir Humphrey Mildmay 429.
- Einarsson, S.: A. Hilén, Longfellow and Scandinavia 575
- Everett, E. M.: G. N. Ray (ed.), The Letters and Private Papers of William Makepeace Thackeray 282.
- Feise, E.: A. Gillies (ed.), J. G. Herder, *Journal meiner Reise im Jahre 1769* 289; L. A. Willoughby (ed.), Papers Read before the Society in 1945 420.
- Fitch, G. B.: S. D. Braun, 'The Courtisane' in the French Theatre from Hugo to Becque 204, W. D. Pendell, Victor Hugo's Acted Dramas and the Contemporary Press 204
- Foerster, N.: Me Tsung Kaung Tang, W. C. Brownell 290
- Françon, M.: A. Barbier (ed.), Poèmes. Par Pierre de Ronsard 200, J. Lavaud (ed.), *Sonnets pour Hélène* Par Pierre de Ronsard 200
- French, J. M.: I. Samuel, Plato and Milton 280
- Hall, V., Jr.: M. T. Herrick, The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1555 209.
- Harrison, T. P., Jr.: E. A. Armstrong, Shakespeare's Imagination 431
- Harrold, C. F.: A. W. Brown, The Metaphysical Society 361.
- Havens, R. D.: J. V. Logan, Wordsworthian Criticism 574; E. De Selincourt, Wordsworthian and Other Studies 290; E. De Selincourt and H. Darbishire (eds.), The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth 507.
- Heilman, R. B.: L. B. Campbell, Shakespeare's "Histories" 275.
- Hinman, C.: B. A. Mackenzie, Shakespeare's Sonnets. Their Relation to His Life 213.
- Houghton, W. E.: C. F. Harrold (ed.), J. H. Newman, *Apologia*

- pro Vita Sua, The Idea of a University, and A Grammar of Assent* 576
- Hughes, M Y D Bush, English Literature in the Seventeenth Century. 1600-1660 190
- Jacobs, R. D : G Paine, Southern Prose Writers 286
- Jones, F L A M D Hughes, The Nascent Mind of Shelley 569
- Kahn, L. W.: M. Besset, Novalis et la pensée mystique 553; H Kamla, Novalis' *Hymnen an die Nacht*, zur Deutung und Datierung 553, A J M. Bus, Der Mythos der Musik in Novalis' *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* 553.
- Kelley, Maurice H F Fletcher (ed.), John Milton's Complete Poetical Works 208.
- Kurrelmeyer, W. W. Kosch, Deutsches Literatur-Lexikon 419
- Lancaster, H. C : C D Brenner, A Bibliographical List of Plays 358, C C. Brody, The Works of Claude Boyer 202; S W. Deierkauf-Holsboer, Vie d'Alexandre Hardy 61, The International Who's Who 291; B. E Young et G P. Young (eds.), Le Registre de La Grange 356.
- Levy, R : F. J. Carmody (ed.), Leopold of Austria, *La Compilations de le science des estouilles* 197
- Lievsay, J. L M Patchell, The *Palmerin* Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction 504.
- Liptzin, S O Oberholzer, Richard Beer-Hofmann 359.
- Llorens, V. R H. Williams, Bocalini in Spain 503.
- McAdam, E. L., Jr.: D. M Foerster, Homer in English Criticism 142
- Malakis, E M.-L. Dufrenoy, L'Orient romanesque in France 1704-1789. T. II 216; A. Fairlie, Leconte de Lisle's Poems on the Barbarian Races 425.
- Manwaring, E. W.: J. Lundblad, Nathaniel Hawthorne and the Tradition of the Gothic Romance 288
- Martz, L. L F. W. Boege, Smollett's Reputation as a Novelist 565.
- Morrisette, B. A., A. Balakian, Literary Origins of Surrealism 63, A J. Mathews, "La Wallonie," 1886-1892 63.
- Myrick, K O. A Harbage, As They Liked It, an Essay on Shakespeare and Morality 277.
- Nitchie, E.: F L Jones, Mary Shelley's Journal 572
- Ogburn, V. H : D N Smith & C Brooks (eds), The Percy Letters 506.
- Painter, S.: A. J Denomy, The Heresy of Courtly Love 363.
- Patch, H R. Joseph Delcourt (ed), Geoffrey Chaucer, *Contes de Canterbury* 140
- Paulsen, W. U. Baumgartner, Adelbert von Chamisso's "Peter Schlemihl" 272, B. Berger, Der moderne deutsche Bildungsroman 417, M. Buhrig, Hebbels dramatischer Stil 413, F. Guttlinger, Die romantische Komodie und das deutsche Lustspiel 413; A. Liebi, Das Bild der Schweiz in der deutschen Romantik 416; P. Ritzler, Der Traum in der Dichtung der deutschen Romantik 416; R. Wehrli, Eichendorffs Erlebnis und Gestaltung der Sinnenwelt 272.
- Pearce, R. H M M Fitzgerald, First Follow Nature 562.
- Pope, E. M. J. S. Diekhoff, Milton's "Paradise Lost" 68.
- Price, L. M. A Loewenberg, Early Dutch Librettos 364.
- Quintana, R.: Herbert Davis, The Satire of Jonathan Swift 578.
- Raysor, T. M : M R Adams, Studies in the Literary Backgrounds of English Radicalism 580.
- Schirokauer, A.: B. Boesch, Deutsche Literaturgeschichte in Grundzügen 348, H. Sparnaay, Karl Lachmann als Germanist 579, A. J. F. Zieglschmid, Das Klein-Geschichtsbuch der Hutterischen Bruder 434.
- Secord, A. W.: W L. Payne, Mr. Review 564
- Shaaber, M. A : H. Granville-Barker, Prefaces to Shakespeare 194; I. J. Semper, *Hamlet* without Tears 194.
- Smith, M. B. A McK. Terhune, The Life of Edward Fitzgerald 432.

- Spivey, H. E. · K. B. Taft (ed.),  
Minor Knickerbockers 214.
- Spurlin, P. M. : G. R. Havens (ed.),  
J.-J. Rousseau, *Discours sur les  
Sciences et les Arts* 423.
- Taylor, A. :** M. Luthi, Das euro-  
päische Volksmärchen 422
- Thorp, W. : Charles Olson, Call Me  
Ishmael 141.
- Tupper, F. S. · M. Prior, The Lang-  
uage of Tragedy 560
- Tuve, R. · E. C. Dunn, The Concept  
of Ingratitude in Renaissance  
English Moral Philosophy 427.
- Wegelin, C. : R. W. Short (ed.), Four  
Great American Novels 143
- Wellek, R. · H. Grégoire, R. Jakob-  
son, M. Szeftel, J. A. Joffe (eds.),  
La Geste du Prince Igor' 502.
- Whittredge, R. · J. Casaldueiro, Jorge  
Guillén *Cántico* 212
- Wilson, H. S. · T. W. Baldwin,  
Shakespeare's Five-Act Structure  
494
- Witherspoon, A. M. · D. C. Allen  
(ed.), *Essays* by Sir William  
Cornwallis, the Younger 206.
- Wolff, H. · M. H. Schneider, Quest  
for Mysteries 500.

